A

SPECIMEN

Of some

ERRORS and *DEFECTS*

IN THE

History of the Reformation

OF THE

Church of *ENGLAND*;

Wrote by

GILBERT BURNET, D.D.

now Lord Bishop of *Sarum*.

By *ANTHONY HARMER*.

LONDON,

Printed for *Randall Taylor*, near *Stationers-Hall*. 1693.

A Specimen of some Errors and defects in the late History of the Reformation of the Church of *England*.

IT *ought not to be esteemed any Disrespect to the Author of the* late History of the Reformation of the Church of *England, now advanced to an eminent station therein, nor any Indignity offered to the Work it self; if the Errors and Defects of it be discovered and published by others. To examine the Truth of things proposed, is a privilege common to all men: Nor can this* Great Historian *justly take it ill, if the title of* Infallible, *which he with so great strength of reason opposeth in others, be denied to himself, especially since himself hath laid down this excellent Rule, that* ingenuous persons ought not to take Hist. Reform. p. 1. p. 264.

take things on truſt eaſily, no not from the greateſt Authors.

At leaſt it will be allowed, that when a Forreigner (however eminent and learned) undertaketh to write the Hiſtory of any Nation, or part of it; the Natives have more than ordinary right to examine the truth, and diſcover the miſtakes of it; leſt otherwiſe the honour of their Countrey ſhould ſuffer any prejudice by a falſe Relation of its Tranſactions. This examination will be ſo much the more neceſſary and ſerviceable, by how much the Hiſtory hath obtained the greater reputation in the World: ſince where any Hiſtory acquireth (as this hath moſt deſervedly) ſuch an univerſal reception, as to be read, and eſteemed by all at home, to be tranſlated into other Languages abroad, to be accounted by all moſt perfect in its kind; that univerſal reputation will the more effectually contribute to the propagation of the Errors contained in it: and further ſince

(as

(*as the Author himself not vainly imagins*) it is a Work that may live some time in the World; *those Errors, which tend to the prejudice of truth and dishonour of the Nation, will be perpetuated, unless this remedy, of a publick detection of them, be allowed.* Par. 2. in Praf. p. 13.

I do not hereby pretend to detract from the honour due to this History; nor do I presume so much as to insinuate, what the Historian himself is pleased to own, his unfitness for such a work, by reason of his unacquaintedness with the Laws and Customs of this Nation, not being born in it: *however the desire and encouragement of Great Persons did herein overrule his Modesty. I am not so vain as to imagin, that I can in the least blast a reputation so firmly and so deservedly established; nor is that any part of my design. On the contrary, I should give to this History those praises, which are due to it; could I induce my self to believe,* Par. 1. in Pref. p. 8.

lieve, that my ſuffrage could add any thing to that great opinion, which the World hath already entertained of it. The only reaſons which have drawn me to this Undertaking, are the love of truth, and concern for the honour of the Reformation of our Church; which will receive at leaſt ſome ſmall advancement by the diſcovery of any errors committed and believed in the Hiſtory of it.

If Varillas, Le Grand, *and others have been ſucceſsfully triumphed over, and baffled by the Hiſtorian, who have already publiſhed Reflections, Animadverſions, or Corrections of this Hiſtory, being mere ſtrangers to our Nation, and the Hiſtory of it; and deſigning not in the leaſt the diſcovery of truth, or reſtauration of Hiſtory, but only to gratify their private paſſions, and to vilify the honour and juſtice of our Reformation: if their attempts have ſucceeded ſo ill, that will not diſcourage me, who do not altogether labour under the ſame diſadvantages with them,*

them, and am not conſcious to my ſelf of any ſiniſter deſign. Or if they have given to the Hiſtorian juſt occaſion to treat them with ſome ſcorn and contempt, I do not much fear the ſame treatment, which yet if it ſhould happen, will not affright me; nor yet deterr me from enquiring further into the truth of things, eſpecially thoſe relating to our Church; as I ſhall have leiſure and opportunty.

It ought not, nor can it be ſuppoſed, that I have diſcovered, and in theſe Papers publiſhed, all the Errors committed in this Hiſtory: I have indeed read the whole, but have not had opportunity to examine the truth of a third part of it. In that ſmall part which I have examined, I have detected all the following miſtakes, (for which reaſon I call it a Specimen*) ſo that if I had preſent leiſure and means to purſue the examination throughout; I could ſcarce hope to find the remaining part free from Errors. But I would not beſtow too much time upon it; nor if I would,*

would, do I enjoy yet fit opportunity. The Reflections of Varillas, Le Grand, *or any others upon this Hiſtory I have not read ſince they were firſt publiſhed; and then I had entertained no thoughts of ſuch a deſign: ſo that if any obſervation of mine be common to them, it is by chance. But I do not much fear it, having for the moſt part drawn my Obſervations from Books and Records which they never ſaw.*

As for Mr. Fulman's *Corrections, which the Hiſtorian hath publiſhed in the end of his ſecond Volume, I have not inſiſted on any miſtakes obſerved by him; unleſs where he hath either miſtaken himſelf, or not ſufficiently cleared the matter. In the whole I have made uſe of the ſecond Edition of the Hiſtory, which (as the title bears) hath been* corrected.

Pars

Pars Prima.

Page 4. *Line* 38. L.

"Cardinal *Wolsey* in the mean while was "put in hopes of the Archbishoprick of *Toledo*.

THE Historian seemeth to have been ignorant, that the Cardinal did for several years receive a very large Pension out of the Archbishoprick of *Toledo*. Not many weeks since I saw an Original Letter writ with the Cardinal's own hand to Dr. *Lee*, his Agent in the Emperour's Court; wherein, among other things, he commanded him to expostulate with the Emperour's Ministers for the non-payment of the Pension reserved to him out of the Archbishoprick. The exact summ due to him is therein inserted: but having not then taken any minutes of the Letter, not so much as the date of it, I will not affirm any thing particular of the summ. Yet to do justice to the memory of the Cardinal, lest he should be thought to have been bribed by any Forreign Prince to act against the interest of his Master, I will add, that when *Tournay* was delivered by K. *Henry* to the *French*, in the year 1518, the Embassadour of the K. of *Spain* did privately offer to the Cardinal 100000 Crowns in the name of his Master, if he would cause the Cittadel of *Tournay* to be demolished before the delivery of it: which offer the Cardinal

Lettere di Cardinal Bibiena entre Lettere di Principi, lib. 1. p. 33.

dinal generously refused, because contrary to the Articles agreed between his Master & the *French* King.

Pag. 8. *lin.* 1.

II. " *Cavendish*'s Life of Cardinal *Wolsey* is cited " out of a Manuscript, *ex MSS. Nobilis Viri, &c.*

This Life hath been twice printed: So that it need not to have been cited with so much pomp out of a Manuscript: Or if the written differs from the printed Copy, that should have been observed. If that long passage, giving a character of the Cardinal, which the Historian here transcribeth, be taken *Verbatim* out of the Manuscript: We have just reason to suspect, that the *Life* contained in this Manuscript was not written by *Cavendish*, but by some other, who enlargeth on his words. For in the printed Copies, that passage is not to be found; although somewhat like to it, in much fewer words, may be read therein. Yet I have seen a fair Manuscript Copy of *Cavendish*'s Life, written above a hundred years since, agreeing in all things with the printed Copy.

III. *Pag.* 8. *lin.* 38. *in marg.*

" Cardinal *Wolsey* exchanged the Bishoprick " of *Duresm* for the Bishoprick of *Winchester*, and " had restitution of the Temporalities of *Win-* " *chester* 4 *Maii*, *anno* 20 *H.* 8.

Par. 2. *Append. p.* 411. The day here assigned for the restitution of the Temporalities of *Winchester*, viz. 4 *Maii*, falls into the year 1528. To which *Mr. Fulman* justly objects, that the See of *Winchester* seems

seems not to have been void before the *9th of September* this year, for that *Fox*'s Regiſter reacheth ſo far. To this the Hiſtorian anſwers, *that he took all theſe dates from the Rolls and muſt add that he hath often ſeen cauſe to queſtion the exactneſs of Clerks in enrolling of dates.* To put the force of Mr. *Fulmans* objection beyond diſpute, I will add that *Fox* died not till the 14. of *Sept.* 1528. So that it cannot be avoided, but that either the Record or the Hiſtorian muſt be miſtaken. The Hiſtorian chargeth it on the Record, and not content with this, brings the ſame charge of falſity againſt many other Records. He who ſeeks to overthrow the Teſtimony of Records, in the truth of which the honour of a whole Nation is ſo much concerned, ought to be very ſure. Notwithſtanding his aſſeveration, I examined the Record, and upon ſearch found, that not it, but the Hiſtorian, is miſtaken. For the Record truly ſaith, that the Cardinal received the Temporalities of *Wincheſter* 6 *April* 20 *H.* 8. Which falls in the year 1529, and agreeth very well with the time of *Fox*'s death, and *Wolſeys* inſtallation, which was performed by Proxy 1529. *April* 11. Ibid. *Pat.* 20 *H.* 8. *rot.* 43.

Mr. Fulman had alſo queſtioned the date of the reſtitution of the Temporalities of *Lincoln*, aſſigned to be 4 *Martii*, 5 *H.* 8. becauſe *Wolſey* was not conſecrated till the 26. of *March.* I know not, whether the anſwer ſubjoyned, *That this might be to give him a right to the mean profits by reſtoring the Temporalities before Lady-day, tho' he was not conſecrated till the 26th* belong to *Mr. Fulman*, or to the Hiſtorian. But it proveth, that neither of them knew the

true ſtate of this matter. For whereas the reſtitution of the Temporalities of *Lincoln* to *Wolſey* before his conſecration, is here repreſented to have been (if true) an extraordinary caſe, owing to his great favour and power at Court: The truth is, that at that time, and for ſeveral Ages before, Biſhops received their Temporalities from the King immediately after their Confirmation, even before Conſecration; and at their Confirmation did of courſe take out a writ from the Archbiſhop to the King, ſignifying their Confirmation, and in vertue of it deſiring reſtitution of their Temporalities to be granted to them. *Wolſey* therefore being provided to the Biſhoprick of *Lincoln* by the Pope on the 6*th* of *Febr.* no wonder, that as ſoon as his Bulls came into *England*, and had been allowed by the Archbiſhop, he ſhould immediately receive his Temporalities before conſecration.

Regiſt. Warham.

IV. *Pag.* 9. *lin.* 1.

" Even after *Wolſey* was Cardinal, *Warham* " as Lord Chancellor took place of him, as ap- " pears from the Journals of the houſe of Peers, " 7 *H.* 8. and afterwards (viz. after that *Wolſey* " was made Lord Chancellor) gave him place; " as appears on many occaſions, and particu- " larly in the Letter written to the Pope 1530. " which the Cardinal ſubſcribed before *Warham.*

Many miſtakes and falſe conſequences are contained in theſe lines. For 1. if *Wolſey* in the quality of Lord Chancellor, took place of *Warham*; it would follow that the Lord Chancellors, as ſuch, ought to precede the Archbiſhops

ſhops of *Canterbury*: The contrary of which is known to be and to have always been true. 2dly. If *Warham*, when Lord Chancellor, took place of *Wolſey*, when Cardinal, in the houſe of Peers; it doth not follow, that at that time he took place of him elſewhere, as the Hiſtorian would inſinuate. For in the Houſe the Chancellor precedeth all other Peers, and even the Archbiſhop of *Canterbury* among the reſt, as being in virtue of his Office Speaker of the Houſe. Nor, could *Wolſey* be ſo extravagantly vain as to deſire the Great Seal only that he might precede *Warham* in the Parliament. For, as the Hiſtorian obſerveth, *he affected to govern without Parliaments.* And accordingly for many years after he obtained the Great Seal, had no Parliaments. And even after the Seal was taken from him, he ſtill took place of *Warham* in the houſe of Peers. 3dly. If in the Letter wrote to the Pope 1530. The Cardinal ſubſcribed before *Warham*; he could not do this in the quality of Lord Chancellor, as the Hiſtorian imagins. For the Great Seal had been taken from him in the preceding year 1529, *October* 17. So that ſome other reaſon of *Wolſey*'s precedence muſt be enquired. And that reaſon is very obvious. For *Wolſey* took place of *Warham*, even before and after he was Lord Chancellor, as being Cardinal. This is confirmed by the relation of *Cavendiſh*: Who in his *Life* ſaith, that *Warham* checked him for his preſumption in carrying himſelf as his equall; but that ſhortly after *Wolſey* obtained to be made Cardinal, and thereby got the better of *Warham* in that point.

Pag. 8.

Cap. 4.

V. *Pag.* 9. *lin.* 4.

" We have nothing on Record, to ſhew " what a ſpeaker he (Cardinal *Wolſey*) was.

If the word *Record* be here uſed in the Law-ſence of it; we grant it to be true: But then it is not very pertinent. But if it be uſed in an Hiſtorical ſence, it is a miſtake. For to paſs by the many Letters, Diſpatches, Inſtructions, *&c.* Which remain of the Cardinals own writing, and which manifeſt that he had a great command of words as well as knowledge of things: We have the aſſurance of one who (as the Hiſtorian himſelf elſewhere obſerveth) *knew him very well, and would not flatter him*, that he was much famed for his Eloquence. *His ſentences in the Star-chamber were ever ſo pithy and witty; that upon all occaſions they aſſigned him, for the fluent eloquence of his tongue, to be their expoſitor in all proceedings, —— he had an eſpecial gift of natural eloquence, and a fyled tongue to pronounce the ſame: That he was able therewith to perſuade and allure all men to his purpoſes.* From hence it may appear how unhappy the conjecture of the Hiſtorian is; who detracting from the praiſes of the Cardinal, ſuppoſeth that he was no better a Speaker than the preceding Chancellors, whom at the ſame time he maketh to have been very ſorry Orators.

avendiſh in his Life p. 2. 3.

VI. *Pag.* 11. *lin.* 57.

" When any See was vacant, the King recom-" mended one to the Pope; upon which his " Bulls were expedited at *Rome*; and ſo by a " War-

[illegible]

"Warrant from the Pope he was consecrated, "and invested in the Spiritualities of the See.

The Historian here undertaketh to describe the way and process of making Bishops in *England*, received for above 300 years before the Reformation. In his description of it he hath committed several mistakes. For, first, this method was not much used in *England*, until within less than 200 years before the Reformation. Secondly, It was not even then always used: For sometimes within that term Bishops were elected, confirmed and consecrated, without consulting the Pope in the least, or expecting any Bulls from him. Thirdly, Even after the method of expecting Papal Bulls, and proceeding in virtue of them was fully setled: the King did not always recommend, nor did the Pope always grant his Bulls to the person recommended. But sometimes the Pope staid not for his Recommendation, but granted his Bulls to whom he thought fit: or after he had received the King's Letters granted his Bulls to some other, whom himself liked better, or whom the Archbishop or some powerfull Nobleman had recommended. Indeed for about sixty years before the Reformation our Kings had got the better of the Popes in this matter, and drawn the disposition of Bishopricks to themselves, yet not altogether (for the Popes by their authority and pleasure disposed of *Worcester* at least three times together within that term) and after all, 4thly, the Bishops were not first consecrated and then invested in the Spiritualities of the See. But the practice

was all along contrary. For they received the Spiritualities of their Sees, immediately upon Confirmation; and the ſentence of their Confirmation was ever accompanied with a decree for their being put in poſſeſſion of their Spiritualities, and a mandate directed to the Guardian of the Spiritualities to deliver them up to them.

Pag. 11. *lin.* 35.

VII. " Though the Parliament and two or three " high-ſpirited Kings, had given ſome inter- " ruption to the cruel exactions and other illegal " proceedings of the Court of *Rome*; yet that " Court always gained their deſigns in the end.

Not always: For if that were true, our Nation had indeed been very tame: But I hope the *Engliſh* are not deſcended of ſuch a daſtardly generation. Our Anceſtors had before the Reformation got the better of the Court of *Rome*, in many points controverted between them, and thoſe of the greateſt moment. Further not onely two or three of our *High-ſpirited* Kings had given ſome interruption to that Court. Of all our Kings ſince the Conqueſt, *Richard* II. and *Henry* VI. were the fartheſt from being *high-ſpirited*. Yet very great, if not the greateſt, interruption was given in their Reigns. Not to ſay, that the interruption under *Edward* III. was not made till the latter end of his Reign, when he was nothing leſs than *high-ſpirited*.

Pag. 12. *lin.* 5.

VIII. " But when this began (*viz.* That Biſhops " receiving their Temporalities from the King, ſhould

" ſhould renounce the benefit of the Papal Bulls " in relation to them, or any Claim to them, " to be derived from thence.) I leave to the " more Learned in the Law to diſcover.

I do not pretend to be Learned in the Law: Yet my ſmall knowledge in the Antiquities of my Country, enableth me to diſcover this, if it is to be called a *Diſcovery*. This Cuſtom began in the Year 1272, when a like Renunciation was required of *Robert Kilwardby*, collated by the Pope to the Archbiſhoprick of *Canterbury*. And ſhortly after the Papal Bulls of Proviſion increaſing, the matter was fully ſetled about the Year 1300.

Pag. 21. *lin* 45. IX.

" In the Days of King *Edgar*, moſt of the " Secular Clergy being then married, and re- " fuſing to put away their Wives, were by " *Dunſtan*, &c. turned out of their Livings.

The Hiſtorian here, and in the following Lines, ſeemeth to have been Ignorant of the ancient *Engliſh* Hiſtory. *Dunſtan*, *Ethelwald*, and *Oſwald*, ejected the married Secular Clergy only out of two Cathedral Churches, and ſome few Monaſteries (if the then Poſſeſſors of Monaſteries may be called Seculars). They endeavoured indeed to eject them out of other Cathedrals and Monaſteries; but could not effect their Deſign. As for the great Body of the Secular Clergy, the Pariſh-Prieſts; *Dunſtan* and his Complices were ſo far from turning moſt of them out of their Livings, on account

count of their Marriages; that they never attempted it: They declaimed indeed furiously against their use of Marriage, as sinful, and would have perswaded them from it; but never forbad it to them by any solemn Sanction, much less deprived them of their Livings upon it. All this the Historian might have learned from the Writings of our eminent Divines, at the time of the Reformation; if he thought himself not obliged to read the ancient Histories of our Nation. For Bishop *Poynet* in his *Defence of Priests Marriages*, maintains, that Marriage of Priests was not forbidden in *England* before King *Henry* the First. And when Dr. *Martin* in his Answer to *Poynet*, exclaimed against his Assertion as false; the Annonymous Author of the long and learned *Defence of Priests Marriages*, published by Archbishop *Parker*, defended it, and shewed the truth of it from the antient Histories; proving that *Dunstan*, *Ethelwald*, and *Oswald*, expelled Secular married Priests, only out of some Cathedral Churches. All which is more largely and accurately proved by the Archbishop in his Additions to that Treatise.

Cap. 13.

Pag. 214.

Pag. 215.

Pag. 280. &c.

X. *Pag.* 21. *lin.* 49.

"There is in the Rolls an *Inspeximus* of King "*Edgar's*, erecting the Priory and Convent of "*Worcester*——signed by the King, two "Archbishops, five Bishops, six Abbots (but "neither Bishoprick nor Abbey are named) "six Dukes, and five Knights; but there is no "Seal to it.

Had this Historian been acquainted with our *English*

Engliſh Antiquities, he would have known; that this very Charter hath been often and long ſince publiſhed in the *Monaſticon*, in *Spelman's* Councils, and elſewhere; and would not have imagined himſelf to have diſcovered ſome rare Secret in this *Inſpeximus*. Or if he had been acquainted with our Rolls, he would not have expected to find in an *Inſpeximus*, the Seal of an Original Charter, enrolled in it: Or if he had been converſant in our ancient Records and Charters made before the *Norman* times, he would have ſpared his Obſervations of the want of a Seal to this Charter (although he had ſeen the Original Charter, and obſerved this in it) and of the not naming either Biſhoprick, or Abbey therein. For they who know this to be the Caſe of the far greater part of the Inſtruments and Charters of thoſe times; would no more have made ſuch an Obſervation; than after having ſaid that they had ſeen a Man named *Titius*, they would have added that he had a Noſe on his Face.

Pag. 22. *lin.* 10.

" The Monks being thus ſetled in moſt Ca- XI.
" thedrals of *England*. (*So alſo p.* 187. *lin.* 20.)
" King *Edgar* converted moſt of the Chapters
" into Monaſteries.

This ſurely was wrote at adventure. Mr. *Fulman* had before obſerved, that the Monks were not ſetled in half the Cathedrals of *England*. To which I may add, that they were then ſetled in no more than two Cathedrals, *viz.* *Winchester* and *Worceſter*: Nor were any more *Par.* 2. *Append. pag.* 412.

more Chapters converted into Monaſteries, in the time of King *Edgar*. The married Clergy were then indeed ejected out of *Ely*, and Monks planted in their Room. But that Church was not a Cathedral until near 140 years after. Afterwards indeed, about the end of the eleventh Age, Monks were ſetled in ſome other Cathedrals, or Epiſcopal Sees fixed in Monaſteries: to omit, one Cathedral, (*viz.* that of *Canterbury*) in which Monks were introduced in the beginning of the ſame Age. But after all, far from being ſetled *in moſt Cathedrals*, they were ſetled in no more than Nine, *viz.* *Canterbury*, *Wincheſter*, *Dureſm*, *Worceſter*, *Rocheſter*, *Ely*, *Norwich*, *Bath*, and *Coventry*. The Church of *Carliſle* indeed was poſſeſſed by Regulars; but thoſe were Canons, not Monks.

XII. *Pag.* 22. *lin.* 10, 15.

" The Monks being thus ſetled, gave themſelves up to idleneſs and pleaſure, having in " their hands the chief Encouragments of " Learning, and yet doing nothing towards it: " but on the contrary decrying and diſparaging it all they could.

This is a very hard Cenſure to paſs upon a whole Order of men, who were once very honourable, but always ſerviceable in the Church. On the contrary, after they were thus ſetled (*viz.* by *Dunſtan*, *Ethelwald*, and *Oſwald*, in the Reign of *Edgar*) they ſet themſelves in with great Induſtry to reſtore Learning, and root out that univerſal Ignorance which had then prevailed in *England*: and effectually per-

performed it. Insomuch, as whereas before that time scarce any Secular Priest in *England*, could read or write a *Latin* Epistle; within few years (as *Elfric* a learned Disciple of *Ethelwald* boasteth) the face of things was so changed by the endeavours of *Dunstan*, and his Master *Ethelwald*, that Learning was generally restored, and began to flourish. At that time, and long after, the Monasteries were the Schools and Nurseries of almost the whole Clergy, as well Secular as Regular: For the Universities (if there were any) were then very mean Societies; and the whole Learning of the Nation was then in a manner confined to their Cloysters. As the Universities increased, they gradually decreased: yet still retained and cultivated Learning, till about the middle of the 13*th* Age; when the *Mendicant* Orders arose, who by their Hypocrisie, jugling Tricks, and extraordinary Industry, ran down both them and the Secular Clergy. Within two hundred years the Mendicants became contemptible; and then both the Monks and the Seculars began to recover their ancient Credit, and long before the Reformation, had made great progress in the Restauration of Learning. They had all along brought up their Novices in Learning; every Great Monastery having for that purpose a peculiar Colledge in one of the Universities; and even to the time of their Dissolution, they continued to bring up great numbers of Children at School at their own Charge for the Service of the Church: and immediately before the Reformation, many of the great Monasteries were so many Nurseries of Learning

Præf. ad Grammat. Saxon.

ning; and the Superiors of them very Learned themſelves, and Promoters of Learning in others. Such were *Kiddermin*ſ*ter* Abbot of *Winchelcomb*, *Goldwell* Prior of *Canterbury*, *Voche* Abbot of St. *Auſtins*, *Wells* Prior of *Ely*, *Holbeach* Prior of *Worceſter*, *Iſlip* Abbot of *Weſtminſter*, *Webbe* Prior of *Coventry*, and many others. I do not hereby Apologize for the Lazineſs of the Monks in the middle Ages; but maintain, that both in the time of *Edgar*, and ſome time after, and immediately before the Reformation, they deſerved a contrary Character to what the Hiſtorian giveth of them; and that even in the worſt times, they were far from being Enemies, and Oppoſers of Learning; as he would have it believed.

XIII. *Pag.* 22. *lin.* 31.

" To ſuppreſs ſome Monaſteries was thought " as juſtifyable, as it had been many Ages be- " fore, to change Secular Prebends into Ca- " nons Regular.

This is not ſo accurately expreſſed: the converſion of Secular Prebendaries into Canons Regular the Hiſtorian ſuppoſeth to have been made often, and in many Churches. But it was never done ſave in one Cathedral Church of *England*, that of *Carliſle*. Secular Prebendaries had in ſeveral Churches been changed into Monks. But Monks are a diſtinct Order from Canons Regular.

XIV. *Pag.* 23. *lin.* 12.

" *Wickliffe* was ſupported by the Duke of " *Lan-*

" *Lancaster*—— the Bishops could not pro-
" ceed against him, till the Duke of *Lancaster*
" was put from the King; and then he was
" condemned at *Oxford*.

It might have become *Varillas* very well to have wrote this of *Wickliffe*; but such a mistake is unworthy of an accurate and Reformed Historian, who ought especially to take care of doing justice to the Memory of that Great man. Far from being condemned at *Oxford* during his own Life, or the Life of the Duke of *Lancaster*, his Person was had in great Esteem and Veneration at that University to the last, and his Writings, for many years before and after his Death, were as much read and studied there, as of *Aristotle*, or the Master of the *Sentences*: Nay, so much concerned was that University for his Reputation; that near twenty years after his Death, hearing that false Reports had been spread abroad in foreign Parts, as if *Wickliffe* had been convicted of Heresie in *England*, and his Body thereupon disinterred and burnt: the Chancellor and Senate of the University published a *Manifesto*; wherein they gave to him a great Character of Learning and Piety, called him *a valiant Champion of the Faith*; and declared that he had never been convicted of Heresie, nor his Body disinterred; *Absit enim, quod tantæ probitatis virum*, &c. Indeed four years after this, the Authority of the Pope and King concurring with the restless Endeavours of Archbishop *Arundel*, several of his Writings were condemned and burnt at *Oxford*; and eighteen years after this his Body was taken up and burned. *Pag.*

Vide apud Joannis Huss *in calce.*

XV. *Pag.* 23. *lin.* 13.

"Many Opinions are charged upon *Wick-*
"*liffe*; but whether he held them or not, we
"know not, but by the Testimony of his Ad-
"versaries.

It seems the Historian knew not any certain means of gaining Information of *Wickliff's* true Opinions; but when he would include all others in the same Ignorance of them, we must desire to be excused. We have as many of the Works of *Wickliffe* yet extant, as (if Printed together) would make four or five Volumes in *Folio*. And whether so many Books be not sufficient to teach us his Opinions, let the Reader judge.

XVI. *Pag.* 23. *lin.* 16.

"*Wickliffe* translated the Bible out of *Latin*
"into *English*, with a long Preface before it; in
"which he reflected severely on the Corrup-
"tions of the Clergy, condemned the worship-
"ping of Saints and Images, *&c.*

This Preface indeed was published at *London*, 1550. under the name of *Wickliffe*, and hath generally passed for his. But after all, *Wickliffe* did not write it, but the Author of the other old *English* Translation of the Bible. For we have two Translations of the Bible made about that time, one by *Wickliffe*, the other by an unknown Person. In the Preface the Author giveth several Specimens of his Translation of many difficult places of Scripture,

pture, which agree not with *Wickliff's*, but with the other Tranſlation. Further, the Author of the Preface inveighs ſharply againſt the Diſcipline and Members of the Univerſity of *Oxford*, which it is certain *Wickliffe* would never have done for Reaſons before mentioned. That *Wickliffe* condemned praying to Saints, we have only the Teſtimony of his Adverſaries. I will not affirm any thing at this time; but I have reaſon to ſuſpect the contrary.

Pag. 25. *lin.* 27. XVII.

" *John Braibrook* Biſhop of *London*, then Lord " Chancellor, *viz.* 26 *Maii*, *Anno* 5. *Ricardi* 2.

His name was *Rober Braibrook*, and he was not Lord Chancellor until the Sixth Year of King *Richard*.

Pag. 35. *lin.* 28. XVIII.

" The two Prelates that were then (in the " Year 1503, between *February* and *December*) " in greateſt eſteem with King *Henry* the 7*th* " were *Warham* Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, and " *Fox* Biſhop of *Wincheſter*.

Warham was not tranſlated from *London* to *Canterbury*, till 1504. *January*, 23.

Pag. 88. *lin.* 10. XIX.

" This (the ſmall Allowance made by the " King to *Crook* his Agent in foreign " Univerſities) I take notice of, becauſe it is " ſaid by others, that all the Subſcriptions " that he procured were bought. (*So pag.* 89.

" *in imo Margine.*) No Money nor Bribes given " for Subſcriptions. (*This is endeavoured to be* " *farther proved, pag.* 90.)

However it might be then thought neceſſary, or uſeful to procure the Determinations of foreign Univerſities, in favour of the Divorce of King *Henry*, thereby the better to ſatisfie the Clergy at home, and to juſtifie the Divorce abroad, yet to thoſe who know very well, that this National Church had ſufficient Authority to determine ſuch a Controverſie without conſulting foreign Univerſities, it will not be accounted a matter of any moment, whether theſe were bribed or not. I will not therefore ſcruple to ſet down the Teſtimonies of two undeniable Witneſſes, who lived at that time; and could not but know the truth of the whole matter. The firſt is of *Cornelius Agrippa*, of whom the Hiſtorian himſelf giveth this Character. Cornelius Agrippa, *a man very famous for great and curious Learning, and ſo ſatisfied in the Kings Cauſe, that he gave it out that the thing was clear and indiſputable, for which he was afterwards hardly uſed by the Emperor, and died in Priſon.* If this Great Perſon then had any partiality in this Cauſe, it lay on the ſide of the King: yet in one of his Books he hath theſe words. *Sed & quis credidiſſet Theologos in rebus fidei & conſcientiæ, non ſolum amore odio, invidia perverti, ſed nonnunquam etiam flecti conviviis, & muneribus abduci a vero; niſi ipſi illius ſceleris fidem feciſſent in Anglicani Matrimonii damnatione? Who would have believed, that Divines in matters of Faith, and Conſcience are not only*

Part 1. pag. 95.

only perverted by *Love, Hatred, or Envy, but also sometimes bribed by Banquets, or drawn from the truth by Gifts, unless themselves had given evident Proof of this Vileness, in condemning the Marriage of the King of* England. The other is Mr. *Cavendish* an honest, plain Gentleman, first a Servant of Cardinal *Wolsey*, afterwards highly obliged by King *Henry*. He in writing the *Life* of his Master the Cardinal, giveth this account of the whole matter. *It was thought very expedient, that the King should send out his Commissioners into all Universities in* Christendom, *there to have this Case argued substantially, and to bring with them from thence every Definition of their Opinions of the same, under the Seal of the University. And thereupon divers Commissioners were presently appointed for this Design. So some were sent to* Cambridge, *some to* Oxford, *some to* Lovain, *others to* Paris, *some to* Orleance, *others to* Padua: *all at the proper Costs and Charge of the King, which in the whole amounted to a great Summ of Money. And all went out of this Realm, besides the Charge of the Embassage to those famous and notable Persons of all the Universities; especially such as bare the Rule, or had the Custody of the University Seals, were fed by the Commissioners with such great Summs of Money, that they did easily condescend to their Requests, and grant their Desires. By reason whereof all the Commissioners returned with their Purpose, furnished according to their Commissions, under the Seal of every several University.* Cap. 15.

XIX.

Pag. 107. *lin.* 5.

" For then (about the time of *Edward* I.) the " Popes, not satisfied with their other Oppres-

" sions,

" ſions, did by Proviſions; Bulls, and other " Arts of that See, diſpoſe of Biſhopricks, Ab- " beys, and leſſer Benefices, to Foreigners, Car- " dinals, and others that did not live in *Eng-* " *land.*

This is a very wide miſtake: For the Popes did not then diſpoſe of Biſhopricks, and Abbeys, to Foreigners, Cardinals, and others that did not live in *England.* The Popes did not give any Biſhoprick of *England*, to any Foreigner that did not live therein, till about Thirty years before the Reformation; when it was not done without the Kings good liking, and in Vertue of ſome ſecret compact between them. As for Abbeys, from the firſt Foundation to their Diſſolution, the Popes never gave any one to a Foreigner, not reſiding. For Cardinal Abbots, there never was any beſides Cardinal *Wolſey*, and of him it is well known, that he had his Abbey from the gift of the King, and lived in *England.* The matter therefore complained of in the Preamble of the Act of Parliament, 25 *Edw.* I. which the Hiſtorian inſerteth, was this: That whereas, Biſhops and Abbots ought to be Elected by their ſeveral Chapters, and Convents, and theſe Elections to be confirmed by the King; the Popes had taken upon them to Annul the Elections of Chapters, and then to ſubſtitute whomſoever themſelves pleaſed, without a new Election; or to diſpoſe of them without expecting any Election (yet ſtill none of theſe were granted to Cardinals, or to Foreigners, not reſiding in *England.*) And whereas the Popes had uſurped

the

the Preſentation of, and given to Aliens, although not reſiding, other Benefices, as Deanries, Prebends, and Parſonages, which ought of right to belong to their proper Patrons; againſt theſe Encroachments, a Remedy was deſired and provided in this Act. Several Foreigners had a little before this time been preferred to Biſhopricks, ſuch as *Boniface* Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, *Adomarus de Leſignan* Biſhop of *Winchester*, *Petrus de Aqua-blanca* Biſhop of *Hereford*. But theſe came in by the Election of their ſeveral Chapters, overawed thereto by the Power and Authority of King *Henry* III, to whoſe Queen they were related by near Kindred, and after all reſided upon their Sees, unleſs when diverted by Employment in the buſineſs of the King or Church. But as for Deanries, Prebends, and Parſonages, the Uſurpation of the Popes in the diſpoſal of them was intollerable. Theſe they granted to Cardinals and other Aliens, not reſiding, without all Shame. Inſomuch, as I remember to have ſeen an Epiſtle of the Biſhop of *Salisbury* to the Pope, wrote about that time; wherein complaining, that the Advowſon of his Benefices was taken from him by Papal Proviſions, he ſends to him a Liſt of all the Prebends, and Prebendaries of his Church of *Salisbury*; and adding to the name of every one by the Preſentation of what Biſhop, or by the Proviſion of what Pope they obtained their ſeveral Prebends, demonſtrates that more of the then Prebendaries, had come in by Papal Proviſion, than by the Preſentation of the Biſhop the proper Patron: that ſo, if poſſible, he might ſhame

the Pope out of the like Uſurpation for the future. Nor was the caſe of other Churches, particularly of *York* and St. *Pauls*, unlike at this time.

XI. *Pag.* 108. *lin.* 46.

" When *Henry* the 4th had treaſonably u-
" ſurped the Crown, all the Biſhops (*Carliſle*
" only excepted) did aſſiſt him in it.

Many accuſations of the Biſhops of *England* may be found in *Prynn*: But I dare affirm, that a falſer cannot be found in him. That all the Biſhops were aſſiſting to the Treaſon of *Henry* IV. except *Carliſle*, the Hiſtorian hath no other evidence than this, that none of them, except *Carliſle*, had the courage to proteſt in the houſe of Lords againſt a wicked deſign, then contriving againſt the Perſon of the late King *Richard*. But it doth not hence follow that all the other Biſhops conſented to this wicked deſign, becauſe they made no proteſtation againſt it; which would have done no ſervice to their injured Sovereign, and onely expoſed their own perſons to the fury of an enraged multitude. It is not to be doubted that many of the Biſhops of that time retained their Allegiance to King *Richard* as long as the iniquity of the time would permit them, although they cared not to become Martyrs in the cauſe. At leaſt it is certain that the intereſt of *Walden* Archbiſhop of *Canterbury* was ſo cloſely linked to his, that there could be no ſuſpition of his acting againſt his Prince; and accordingly the Treaſon of *Henry* the 4th obtaining ſucceſs, they were both depoſed together. It is alſo well known,

P. L 2005

known, that *Scrope* Archbishop of *York* immediately after took up Arms against King *Henry*, published a bold Declaration of his Treason and Injustice; and his forces being dissipated lost his head in the Quarell. We are farther assured, that both these Archbishops, with the Bishops of *London*, *Exeter*, *Litchfield* and *Landaffe*, attended King *Richard* faithfully in his Marches, after *Henry* of *Lancaster* had landed and declared against him; and assisted him to their utmost; untill the Commonality running into the *Duke* of *Lancaster* on all sides, and the King fleeing for his safety, they were forced to give way to the violence of a rapid Revolution.

Pag. 110. *lin.* 22. *& ult.* XXII.

" The first Letter is to *Henry Chichley* Archbishop of *Canterbury*——it bears date the " fifth day of *December* 1426.——then follows the Appeal of the Archbishop dated " the 6*th* of *April* 1427.——There is also another Letter dated the 6*th* of *May*, directed " to the Archbishop.——But the next Letter " is of an higher strain. It is directed to the " two Archbishops——this is dated the 8*th* " day of *December*, the 10*th* year of his Popedom

The History of the proceedings between Pope *Martin* and Archbishop *Chichley* in the matter of Provisoes would have been very acceptable had not the Historian marred all for want of a little Chronology. He hath here disposed matters in a fair Historical series. But

moſt unhappily thoſe two Letters which he maketh to have been wrote at ſo great a diſtance of time from each other (I mean the firſt and laſt of thoſe here mentioned) were wrote within very few days of each other. This with a little care might eaſily have been perceived. For the 8*th* day of *December* in the tenth year of the Popedom of *Martin*, falls into the year 1426. By this miſtake the whole contexture of this narration is overthrown. But farther, both theſe Letters were wrote upon the ſame day: And the Hiſtorian in tranſcribing the Popes firſt Letter to the Archbiſhop, (which he hath publiſhed in the *Collection of Records Pag.* 98. hath given a falſe date of it. For whereas it is truly dated *Quinto Id. December.* He hath changed this into *quinto die December.* The other Letter alſo which he ſaith to have been wrote the 8*th* of *December*, is in the Manuſcript Copy dated as the former, *quinto Id. Decembr. anno Pontificatus noſtri decimo* viz. 1427. *December* 9.

XXIII. *Pag.* 111. *lin.* 2.

"Then follow Letters from the Univerſity "of *Oxford*, the Archbiſhop of *York*, the Bi"ſhops of *London*, *Dureſm* and *Lincoln* to the "Pope—bearing date the 10*th* and the 25*th* "of *July*.

I did many years ſince tranſcribe out of an Authentick Regiſter all the Inſtruments of this conteſt between the Pope and the Archbiſhop here mentioned by the Hiſtorian, and as many more relating to the ſame matter, which ſeem

to

to have been wanting in his Manuſcript; ſo that I am thereby enabled to correct the miſtakes of the Hiſtorian herein. From the words of the Hiſtorian any Reader would imagine that the Letter of the Univerſity was dated on the 10*th* and that of the Biſhops on the 25*th* of *July*. But on the contrary the Biſhops Letter is dated *July* 10*th* and the Univerſities *July* 25*th*. Then whereas the Hiſtorian nameth onely the Archbiſhop of *York* and three Biſhops; in truth that Letter was written in the name of fifteen Biſhops, that is, of all the Biſhops of *England* except three who were then abſent. For *Salisbury* and *Chicheſter* were at that time void.

Pag 111. *lin.* 27. XXIV.

" The Letter of the Pope to the Parliament " is dated the third of *October decimo Pontificat.* " But I believe it is an error of the Tranſcriber, " and that its true date was the 13*th* of *Octo-* " *ber.*

The Hiſtorian imputeth this miſtake to the viciouſneſs of the Copy. But I fear it ought to be imputed to the negligence of the Tranſcriber. For in my Copy 'tis truly dated *Tertio Id. Octobris.* Inſtead of which the Hiſtorian renewing his former error hath in his tranſcript of the Inſtrument ſubſtituted *tertio die Octobris.* To proceed and joyn all the miſtakes of this matter together, the tranſcript of the Archbiſhops ſpeech in the Houſe of Commons, which he giveth to us, is alſo falſe. For it reads *die Veneris*

neris, 30 *Januarii Anno Domini milleſimo quadringenteſimo decimo ſeptimo, Indictione ſextâ, Pontificatus Martini Papæ Anno Undecimo.* All the concurrent notes added to the year of our Lord ſhew that it ſhould be *ann. mill. quadr. viceſimo ſeptimo*, and ſo I doubt not the Manuſcript hath it. Laſtly (to ſay no more of this matter) the concluſion of the Archbiſhops Appeal, as it is by him publiſhed, manifeſts with how little care theſe publick Inſtruments have been tranſcribed, for thus it ends: *præſentibus diſcretis viris. M. W. Lyn. Curiæ Cant. officii, & Thoma B. Archidiacono ſanctarum in Eccleſiâ Lyne. Utriuſque Juris Doctoribus.* Now to miſtake and report falſly the dates of publick Inſtruments is not a matter of light moment. For theſe will neceſſarily betray both Writers and Readers into infinite other miſtakes, while they endeavour to adapt things, and the circumſtances of them to the ſuppoſed, but miſtaken time of other Actions. Beſides all this it diminiſheth the credit of any Hiſtory, ſo that in all other matters the Reader cannot ſafely rely upon it, when he knows the negligence of the Hiſtorian in any part of it. And as for the *Collection of Records*, which make up one half of each Volume of this Hiſtory, they will be of little value, if once there appears juſt reaſon to ſuſpect the care or fidelity of the Tranſcriber. I have not had opportunity or a curioſity to examine one half of the dates of times either in the *Hiſtory* it ſelf, or in the *Collection of Records*; but do aſſure the Reader that of thoſe which I have examined, I found near as many to be falſe as true.

Pag.

Pag. 112. *lin.* 4. XXV.

" The Popes Uſurpations ſtill increaſing, " thoſe Statutes (of Proviſo's and Premunire) " lay dead among the Records, and ſeveral " Cardinals had procured and executed a Le- " gantine Power, which was clearly contrary " to them.

A competent knowledge of the Hiſtory of the *Engliſh* Church, would have prevented ſo large a miſtake. No Cardinals before *Wolſey*, had procured and executed ſuch Legantine Power in *England* ſince thoſe Laws were made. Cardinal *Beaufort* of *Wincheſter* indeed had procured it, but could never execute it, being inhibited by King *Henry* VI, by the advice of Archbiſhop *Chichley*, and forced to renounce his pretended Power: As for the Legantine Power of the Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, which was claimed and exerciſed by them in Quality of *Legati nati*; that was not in the leaſt contrary to theſe Laws, nor ever was ſo accounted; being annexed perpetually to the See of *Canterbury*, ever ſince the Year 1200, and always belonging to them, without any new or diſtinct Bulls.

Pag. 121. *lin.* 33. XXVI.

" The old Cardinal of *Ravenna* was ſo jea- " lous, that the Ambaſſadors of the King were " forced to promiſe him the Biſhoprick of " *Cheſter* (one of the new Biſhopricks, deſigned " to be erected in the Year 1533.) with which " he was well ſatisfied.

If

If in the Promiſes made by the Embaſſadors to the Cardinal, the Hiſtorian found expreſs mention of the new Erection of the Biſhoprick of *Cheſter* promiſed to him, we muſt ſubmit: Otherwiſe it is more probable, that the Biſhoprick deſired by him, and promiſed to him; was the old Biſhoprick of *Lichfield*, which was then commonly called the Biſhoprick of *Cheſter*, and which was then likely to be void very ſhortly, by the Death of Dr. *Blithe* an extreme Old man, who died the following Year.

XXVII. *Pag.* 128. *lin.* 34.

" *Cranmers* Bulls for the Archbiſhoprick of " *Canterbury*, bear date the 21ſt of *February*, " 1533 ——By a tenth Bull dated the 2d of " *March*, the Pall was ſent to him—— when " theſe Bulls were brought into *England*, *Tho-* " *mas Cranmer* was on the 13th of *March* con- " ſecrated.

We have here another Inſtance of the little Exactneſs of the Hiſtorian in the dates of time. I will not take Notice that the firſt Bulls in the the Original bear date the 21ſt of *February*, 1532. For that is indeed 1533, to thoſe who begin their Year on the firſt day of *January*. But the tenth Bull ſending the Pall to *Cranmer*, is dated the 3d of *March*, and he was conſecrated the 30th of *March*.

XXVIII. *Pag.* 129. *lin.* 42.

" The moſt Learned Sir *Henry Spelman*, hath " in no place of his Collections of our Coun- " ſels,

" fels, considered the Constitution of the two " Houses of Convocation; and in none of our " Records have I been able to discover, of " what Persons they were made up in the " time of Popery: and therefore since we are " left to conjecture, I shall offer mine to the " learned Reader. It is that none sate in the " lower House, but those who were deputed " by the inferior Clergy; and that Bishops, " Abbots, mitred and not mitred, and Priors, " Deans and Archdeacons, sate then in the " upper House of Convocation. To which I " am induced by these Reasons, *&c.*

Sir *Henry Spelman* compleated only the first Volume of his Councils which reacheth to the Conquest. Therein he had no opportunity to treat of this matter. For we do not inquire of the Constitution of Convocations in the *Saxon* times, but in the time immediately preceding the Reformation. As for the second Volume of Councils, which reacheth from the Conquest to the Reformation, the Collection of it was only begun by Sir *Henry Spelman*, but compleated and published by others, without any tollerable Care or Skill. No doubt Sir *Henry* knew very well the Constitution of our Convocations before the Reformation, and so do all inquisitive Persons of our Nation; however the Historian may think a discovery herein to be necessary, to the Information of the *Learned Reader*. If he knew it not, he may be excused, as a Foreigner: Or if in none of our Records he were able to discover it, that also may be excused. For neither

are

are all our Records kept at the *Rolls*, nor did the multiplicity of buſineſs permit the Hiſtorian to attend long to the ſearch of them; but that he ſhould proceed to offer his Conjecture, and ſuch a Conjecture, as, if he had induſtriouſly ſought to do it, he could not have made one more Erroneous. We cannot but wonder ſince he had ſufficient means of better Infor-

Par. 2. *in Addend.* P. 413. mation. Mr. *Fulman* hath obſerved, that the Conjecture here propoſed by the Hiſtorian, doth not agree with what he had before deliver'd, that *Pole* as Dean of *Exeter* was a Member of the lower Houſe of Convocation. This demonſtrates the Error of the Hiſtorian, but doth not Correct it. It may be Corrected, and the truth of the whole matter fully diſcovered from the Subſcriptions of the Convocation held in the Year 1536. publiſhed by the

P. 315. Hiſtorian himſelf in the *Addenda* of this firſt part of his Hiſtory: wherein all the Members of the upper Houſe ſubſcribe apart; and then all the Members of the lower Houſe ſubſcribed by themſelves. The Inſtrument of their Subſcription is an Original, (which I did many years ſince tranſcribe) and may be infallibly relyed on.

Therein it appears, that the Biſhops, Abbots and Priors, conſtituted the upper Houſe; and that all Deans, Archdeacons, Proctors of Clergy, and Chapters of Cathedral Churches, ſate in the lower Houſe of Convocation. The

P. 316. Hiſtorian himſelf there ſummeth up all the Members of the lower Houſe, who then ſubſcribed in this manner; 24 Archdeacons, 4 Deans of Cathedrals, three Deans of Collegiate Churches,

Churches, 17 Procurators for the Clergy, and one Master of a College, (*viz.* Provoſt of a Collegiate Church.) Such an Error could not eaſily have been committed by ſo accurate an Author, after he had ſeen and publiſhed ſuch an Inſtrument; if himſelf had vouchſafed ſo much as to read the Records, which he hath publiſhed in his *Collections*, and not left them to be peruſed and tranſcribed by ſome Under-workmen. I ſhould have thought that he ſaw not this Inſtrument, until he had Compoſed and Printed of this part off the Hiſtory; if he had pleaſed in his *Addenda* to have owned and amended a miſtake of ſo great Conſequence, or if in the Second part of his Hiſtory, he had not repeated and confirmed this his erroneous Conjecture touching the Conſtitution of our Convocations before the Reformation. P. 48. & 49.

If it ſhould be ſuſpected, that however it might be in the Convocation of the Year 1536, when the frequent and great Changes preceding and accompanying it, might diſorder and change the method and order before received, yet that it was otherwiſe in precedent times; I anſwer, that it might be undeniably demonſtrated from the Acts of many Convocations, for above 200 years before the Reformation, until that very time, that the Conſtitution of Convocations was all along in this reſpect the ſame. For although the Regiſters of the Convocations be loſt; yet the Acts of many of them remain, and may be found elſewhere. I will give but one Proof of this, but that out of an Authentick Inſtrument. In the Convocation held

held in the Year 1462, the lower House wanting a small Summ of ready Money for some slight occasion, resolved to raise it by imposing small Mulcts upon all the absent Members. To this purpose a List of the names of all the absent Members of the lower House was brought in, and they were these: the Deans of *Sarum*, *Lincoln*, *Windsor*, *Wells*, *Chichester*, the Archdeacons of *Colchester*, *Winchester*, *Surry*, *Taunton*, *Dorset*, &c.

So then the Matter of Fact is put beyond all doubt; that all the Bishops, Abbots and Priors, sate in the upper House; all Deans, Archdeacons, and Proctors of the Clergy; in a word, all the Secular Clergy beneath Bishops, sate in the lower House of Convocation. But I will farther enquire, how it came to be setled in this method. It is notorious that for some time after the present Constitution of Parliaments, was introduced in the Reign of *Henry* III. great numbers of Abbots and Priors were summoned to Parliament by particular Writs directed to every one. I will not now dispute, whether the second and third Estates, the Lords and Commons, then sate together: but most certain it is, that the *Pares*, *Proceres & Baronies Regni*, were those who were summoned to Parliament by particular Writs: At first, the King summoned by particular Writs all the Ecclesiasticks (*viz.* Bishops, Abbots and Priors) who received their Temporalities from the Crown. At least the King summoned as many of them as he pleased. Some Abbots and Priors were perhaps excused from attendance by reason of their Poverty. Thus *Anno* 49. *H.* 3.

there

there were ſummoned Abbots and Priors 104. *Anno* 35. *Edward* I. there were ſummoned 47. *Anno.* 1. *E.* II. there ſummoned 56. *Anno.* 4. *E.* III. there were ſummoned 33. Now all the Abbots and Priors, thus ſummoned by particular Writs, ſate *inter Pares, Proceres & Barones Regni*; and were held a part of the ſecond, as well as of the firſt Eſtate of the Nation repreſented in Parliament. They were a part of the firſt Eſtate as Eccleſiaſtical Prelates, and a part of the ſecond Eſtate, as receiving their Temporalties, and holding their Baronies of the King. For ſuch Abbots and Priors the King was wont to ſummon, as received their Temporalties from him. Afterwards in the Reign of *Edward* III. the number of Abbots and Priors ſummoned by particular Writs was much reduced; and ſo continued till the Reformation; only ſome of the greater Abbots being wont to be ſummoned. The number of them was never unalterably fixed, but received Addition, or Diminution even till the time of *Hen.* VIII. But from the Reign of *Edw.* III. till the Reformation, their number always exceeded twenty, and fell ſhort of thirty. When the Kings therefore ceaſed to ſummon particularly the leſſer Abbots and Priors, they loſt their place in the ſecond Eſtate of Parliament, but ſtill continued to be ſummoned to the Convocation by their ſeveral Biſhops in obedience to the Mandate of the Archbiſhop, commanding them to ſummon to Convocation, to be held at ſuch a time all within their Dioceſs, having Right to ſit therein: When theſe came up to Convocation, as many of them as received

ceived their Temporalties from the King, and had been wont formerly to be ſummoned by him *inter Barones Regni*, and to ſit among them, claimed ſtill their former place in the Convocation, which was to ſit with the Biſhops, whether yet they ſate in one Houſe with the inferior Clergy, or whether they had by this time ſeparated themſelves into a diſtinct upper Houſe, as moſt certainly they did afterwards. This Claim could not reaſonably be denied to ſuch Abbots and Priors, and this giveth a clear Account, how all ſuch Abbots and Priors came to obtain a place in the upper Houſe of Convocation.

But the great difficulty conſiſts in the Caſe of Priors of Cathedral Churches. For I find that ſome time before the Reformation, that they alſo ſate in the upper Houſe; although none of them received their Temporalties from the King, except the Prior of *Coventry*. They were of ſo great Account, that ſome of them had been ſummoned by the King to Parliament, although they owed to him no ſuch Service upon the account of their Temporalties, which they received not from him.

Thus the Prior of *Norwich* was ſummoned *Anno* 1293. but the Prior of *Canterbury* ſeveral times, as *Anno* 49. *Hen.* 3. *Anno* 35. *E.* 1. *Anno* 21. *E.* 2. *and in the Years*, 1399, *and* 1401. This the King might do, either upon extraordinary occaſions with a *Salvo* to their Rights, or pretending to the immediate Superiority of their Temporalties; as he ſometimes did, but was caſt therein, and at length forced to renounce that Claim. However, after the Year 1300, I find none of them ſummoned by the King,

King, but the Prior of *Canterbury*, and him no more than these four times. But when these Priors came to Convocation, summoned by their Bishops, they could not but conceive some Indignation; that when so many Abbots and petty Priors sate in the upper House, themselves should be thrust down to the lower House, who in revenue and interest were equal to the greatest Abbots. So that no wonder if they tryed all possible methods to raise themselves into the upper House, which they at last effected; at least some of them did. At what time, and by what Pretences they did effect it, I cannot certainly affirm. But I suppose, that whereas some of them had gained of the Pope, the priviledge of wearing the Pontifical Habit at solemn times, *viz.* Mitre, Pastoral Staff, *&c.* and had thereupon assumed to themselves the name of *Prelates*; they claimed in vertue of that priviledge, and were admitted to sit in Convocation among the Prelates: Or that whereas it was thought very indecent, that the Prior of *Canterbury*, in whom the Arch-Episcopal Jurisdiction, during a vacancy, was invested, and by whom the Convocations was summoned in that Case, should sit in the lower, and was thereupon removed to the upper House; his Example might facilitate Admission to the Priors of other Cathedrals, and open the way to them.

Pag. 158. *lin.* 5. XXIX.

"Suffragan Bishops were believed to be the "same with the *Chorepiscopi* in the Primitive "Church; which continued in the Western

" Church till the ninth Century; and then " they were put down every where by de- " grees, and now (*Anno* 1534.) revived in *Eng-* " *land*.

If the Historian had pleased to acquaint himself with the State of the Church of *England* before the Reformation, he could not have been Ignorant, that for about 200 years before the Reformation, Suffragan Bishops had been frequent in *England*, not only in large or neglected Dioceſſes (as Mr. *Fulman* imagineth, who hath in part noted the Error of the Historian) but also in ſmaller Dioceſſes, ſuch as *Wells*, and in thoſe wherein the proper Biſhop did generally reſide in Perſon: inſomuch that in many Dioceſſes, whoſe Records are preſerved, there appear a continued Series or Succeſſion of Suffragan, as well as proper Biſhops; and at the time of making this Act (*Anno* 1534.) there ſeemeth to have been a Suffragan Biſhop in every Dioceſs of *England*, ſave *Carliſle*, *Rocheſter* and the *Welch* Dioceſſes; and in ſeveral Dioceſſes more than one. That they were not by this Act revived in *England*, after the diſcontinuance of ſo many Ages, the Hiſtorian might have learned from the very Preface of it, which himſelf relates to begin thus: *Whereas Suffragan Biſhops have been accuſtomed to be had within this Realm*, &c.

Par. 2. *Append. p.* 414.

Pag. 157.

XXX. *Pag.* 161. *lin.* 3.

" Chancellor *More* was the moſt zealous " Champion the Clergy had; ſo he anſwered " this *Supplication (of the Beggars)* by another " in

" in the name of the Souls that were in Purga-
" tory, repreſenting the miſeries they were
" in, &c.

Sir *Thomas More* wrote this *Supplication of Souls*, before he was Lord Chancellor, in the Year 1529, as the Title of it witneſſeth, being then Privy Councellor. He was then indeed Chancellor of the Dutchy of *Lancaſter*; but in this Senſe, I ſuppoſe, the Hiſtorian did not here call him Chancellor: Since the Hiſtorian hath mentioned this *Supplication of the Souls*, and hath given an Abſtract of it, whereby he would ſeem to have read it; I beg leave to repreſent to him, that it would have been very fair in him, if when he related the Tragical Story of the Murder of *Richard Hunne*, ſo much in prejudice of *Fitz-James* Biſhop of *London*, and his Chancellor Doctor *Horſey*, he would have acquainted the Reader, that notwithſtanding the general and violent Suſpitions of their foul dealing therein, Sir *Thomas More*, who was then an eminent Man, and had certain opportunities of knowing the whole truth of the matter, hath in this Treatiſe largely defended both the Biſhop and his Chancellor, and acquitted them from all manner of guilt or injuſtice therein. Pag. 14. & 18.

XXXI.

Pag. 182. *lin.* 6.

" In *Oxford*, the Queſtion being put (*Anno*
" 1535.) Whether the Pope had any other Ju-
" riſdiction in *England*, than any other fo-
" reign Biſhop? it was referred to certain De-
" legates, who agreed in the Negative; and
" the whole Univerſity being examined a-

" bout it man by man, aſſented to their De-
" termination.

I fear that the Hiſtorian had conceived ſome diſpleaſure againſt the Univerſity of *Cambridge*, for that he alloweth not to them, the Honour of having aſſerted betimes the Independency of our National Church upon the See of *Rome*; nor thinks fit to take any notice of them in this matter. I am not bound to engage in the private Quarrels of the Hiſtorian, and therefore ſhall think my ſelf at Liberty to do Juſtice to the Univerſity of *Cambridge*, and to publiſh their Determination herein, which I have done: To which I will here add, that the like Determinations ſeem to have been then made by particular Colledges in the Univerſity apart, and to have been ſubſcribed by the Maſters and Fellows of them. For I have ſeen ſuch an original Inſtrument of one Colledge.

Collect. numb. 1.

XXXII. *Pag.* 186. *lin.* 28.

" What the ancient *Britiſh* Monks were; " and by what Rule they were governed muſt " be left to Conjecture. But from the lit-" tle that remains of them, we find they were " very numerous, and were obedient to the " Biſhop at *Caerleon*; as all the Monks of the " Primitive times were to their Biſhops.

This is not accurately ſaid. The *Britiſh* Monks were ſubject not only to the Biſhop of *Caerleon*, but to their ſeveral Biſhops, in whoſe Dioceſſes they lived. Indeed after that the

Britains

Britains were driven into *Wales*, and ſetled there, all their Biſhops were ſubject to the Archbiſhop of *Caerleon*, and ſo by conſequence were all the Monks alſo ultimately ſubject to him. But the Hiſtorian ſpeaketh here of their immediate Subjection. Beſides, that in this place he treateth of the ancient *Britiſh* Monks, which were before the Conſuſions of the *Gothic* Wars in *Italy*, and before the times of *Benedict*; when the *Britains* were not driven into *Wales*, nor all their Biſhops ſubjected to him of *Caerleon*. But there were at that time ſeveral other Archbiſhops in *Britain*, to whom the Biſhops of their Provinces were as much ſubject; as the Biſhops of the Province of *Caerleon* were to him.

Pag. 186. *lin.* 43. XXXIII

"This Exception of the Abbey of St. *Auſtins* from the Juriſdiction of the Archbiſhop "and his Succeſſors, was granted, that they "might have no diſturbance in the Service of "God. But whether this, with many other "ancient Foundations, were not later Forge-"ries, which I vehemently ſuſpect, I leave to "Criticks to diſcuſs.

That this and all other Charters of Exemption from Epiſcopal Juriſdiction, granted to Monaſteries in *England* before the Conqueſt, were mere Forgeries, is an undoubted truth to all thoſe who are not engaged by Intereſt to defend them. But it is ſomewhat extraordinary in any Writer to lay down Principles confeſſedly falſe or dubious, and then to build upon

them, and raiſe conſequences from them, as if they were indubitably true. This ſeemeth to be done by our Hiſtorian in the following Page; where he layeth down the Exemption of Monks in the ancient Foundations from Epiſcopal Juriſdiction, as one Foundation of their Corruption in Diſcipline, and increaſe in Riches. The firſt Exemption of this kind, really granted to any Monaſtery of *England*, was that given by *William* the Conqueror to *Battel* Abbey, newly founded by him; the Example of which prompted the Monks of other places to counterfeit the like ancient Exemptions, or to purchaſe new ones from the Court of *Rome*.

XXXIV. *Pag.* 187. *lin.* 7.

" About the end of the eighth Century, the " Monks had poſſeſſed themſelves of the grea- " teſt part of the Riches of the Nation. (So " alſo *Par.* 2. *Præfat. pag.* 9. *lin.* 1.) the beſt part " of the Soil of *England* being in ſuch ill hands, " it was the Intereſt of the whole Kingdom to " have it put to better uſes.

Such high Figures of Rhetorick and Hyperbolical Expreſſions are better reſerved for Harangues, and do not well agree with Hiſtory. The end of the eighth Century was the Year of our Lord 800, at which times very few Monaſteries had been yet founded; nor had the Monks then in all appearance gained Poſſeſſion of the hundredth part of the Riches of the Nation. Afterwards indeed they increaſed exceedingly in Number, Riches, and Poſſeſſi-

ons, especially in the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth Centuries; but after all, upon a just Account, they will not be found even in Title to have possessed above a fifth part of the Nation: and considering that long before the Reformation, they were wont to Lease out their Lands to Laymen, for easie Fines, and small Rents, as Bishops and Deans, and Chapters now do; it may be truly said that they did not in reality possess the Tenth part of the Riches of the Nation. Then for that other Charge, that the best part of the Soil of the Nation being in such ill hands, it was the Interest of the Nation to have it put to better uses, it is altogether Erroneous. From the beginning to the end, none ever improved their Lands and Possessions to better advantages, by Building, Cultivation, and all other methods, than the Monks did, while they kept them in their own hands: And when they Leased them out to others, it was the Interest of the Nation to have such easie Tenures continued to great numbers of Persons who enjoyed them. To this may be added, that they contributed to the publick Charges of the Nation equally with the other Clergy; and the Clergy did always contribute in proportion above the Laity. So that we cannot find, to what better uses these Possessions have been since put; save only that inconsiderable part of them, which remains to Bishopricks, Cathedrals, and Schools, founded by King *Henry* VIII.

Pag. 189. *lin.* r. XXXV.

" The Monks became lewd and dissolute,

" and

" and ſo impudent in it, that ſome of their " Farms were Lett, for bringing in a yearly " Tribute to their Luſts.

God forbid, that any Profeſſors of Chriſtianity, much leſs the greateſt Pretenders to it, ſhould be guilty of ſuch monſtrous wickedneſs, or that any others ſhould believe it of them without evident Proof. This Accuſation is taken from *Fuller*'s Church-Hiſtory, who relateth no more than one Example of this kind, and that of a Convent, not of Monks, but of Canons Regular (of *Waltham*) not upon his own knowledge, but the ſingle Teſtimony of a moſt notorious lying Villain, *Stephen Marſhal*; and after all is ſo ingenuous, that he profeſſeth himſelf to diſ-believe it. On the contrary our Author ſuppreſſeth his Authority, and brings no other Teſtimony; raiſeth the number from one to many, and delivereth a dubious matter as a Truth moſt certain. Surely if the Monks had been guilty of any ſuch thing, it could not have eſcaped the knowledge of their Viſitors, who ſearched and divulged all their Faults with the utmoſt Induſtry; nor would it have been unknown to *Bale*, brought up among them, nor omitted by him in his *Engliſh Votaries*, wherein he hath ſet himſelf to defame the Monaſtick Order, and the unmarried Clergy with inſatiable Malice; nor would Inſtances of it be wanting in thoſe many Leiger-Books, of the Monaſteries ſtill remaining, wherein they Regiſtred all their Leaſes, and that for their own private uſe.

Pag. 318.

Pag. 189. *lin.* 10. XXXVI

"The Orders of Begging Fryers at firſt would "have nothing, no real Eſtates but the ground "on which their Houſe ſtood. But after- "wards Diſtinctions were found, for ſatisfy- "ing their Conſciences in larger Poſſeſſions.

Hereby it is inſinuated, that the Begging Fryers, gained to themſelves and poſſeſſed other real Eſtates, beſides the Site of their Convents. But no ſuch thing was done. To the very laſt they had no other real Eſtates in *England*.

Pag. 194. *lin.* 47. XXXVII.

"The uſe of the Scripture in the vulgar "Tongue continued for ſeveral Ages, till the "ſtate of Monkery aroſe; and then it was "not conſiſtent with their Deſigns, nor with "the Arts uſed to promote them, to let the "Scriptures be much known.

The Order of Monks is now extinct in *England*, ſo that whatſoever may be ſaid againſt them, there is no danger of a Reply from them. Yet ſtill ſo much reſpect is owing to the Readers, as not to impoſe any thing upon them, which hath not at leaſt the appearance of truth. That, this Accuſation will not have to thoſe, who know with what Induſtry the Monks in many Nations, but more eſpecially here in *England*, tranſlated the Scriptures into the Vulgar Tongue. We have the Names left of ſeven *Engliſh* Monks, who before the Conqueſt tranſlated the Scriptures, or ſome part of

of it into the *Saxon* Tongue. After the Conqueſt we do not find ſo many Tranſlations made; but of thoſe which were made, as many were owing to the Monks as to the Secular Clergy.

XXXVIII. *Pag.* 215. *lin.* 17.

"*Nix* Biſhop of *Norwich* died the former "Year, tho' *Fuller* in his ſlight way, makes him "to ſit in the Convocation, held in the middle "of the Year 1536.

The Hiſtorian could not have blamed *Fuller*'s ſlight way of writing at a more unlucky moment. For himſelf hath here committed three miſtakes within the compaſs of ſix Lines. The firſt of them is this concerning the time of Biſhop *Nix*'s Death, who died not the former Year, but on the 14th of *January* in this Year; nor will the difference in Computation in beginning the Year ſalve the miſtake. For this Hiſtorian always begginneth the Year on the firſt of *January*. The other two miſtakes follow.

XXXIX *Pag.* 215. *lin.* 13.

"*Nix* Biſhop of *Norwich* had offended the "King Signally, by ſome correſpondence with "*Rome*, and was kept long in the *Marſhalſea*, and "was convicted and found in a *Præmunire*.

I fear, that this alſo was wrote at adventure. The Hiſtorian finding the Biſhop in a *Præmunire*, and in the *Marſhalſea*, without further Enquiry, would ſuppoſe, that the Crime

Norvic. p. 184.

was

was some correspondence with *Rome*, and so gave his Conjecture for History. But had he known the Character of this Bishop, he would not have thought this so much as probable. *Alexander Nevyl*, who knew him well, describeth him to have been the most vitious Clergyman of his time. So that no remaining scruple of Conscience, or supposed Sense of Duty could prompt him at this time to hold any Correspondence with *Rome*: Nor yet could the hope of advancing his Fortune by it, in Case the Papal Power should be restored in *England*, induce him to it. For he was then an extreme old Man, and had been blind many years: But the true Cause of his Conviction and Imprisonment was this, which I shall deliver out of a Record. The Town of *Thetford* in *Norfolk*, had made a Presentment upon Oath before the Kings Judges, touching their Liberties; namely, that none of the said Town ought to be Cited into any Spiritual Consistory, but only into the Court of the Dean of *Thetford*; and that if any Person cited any of that Town into another Spiritual Court, he should forfeit Six shillings and Eight pence for the same. With this the Cholerick old Bishop being enraged, cited *Richard Cockeral*, Mayor of *Thetford*, and others, into his Spiritual Court, and enjoyned them under pain of Excommunication to call a Jury of their Town before them, and forthwith to revoke and cancel the former Presentment. For this the Bishop was attainted in a *Præmunire*, put out of the King's Protection, his Person imprisoned, his Lands, Goods and Chattels forfeited to the King, by

Term Hilary 23 H. 8. coram Rege rot. 15.

a Sentence in the King's-Bench Court, in the beginning of the Year 1534. With part of the Biſhop's Fine and Forfeiture upon this Attainder, the Glaſs-windows of *King's*-Colledge Chappel in *Cambridge* are ſaid to have been bought and ſet up.

XL. *Page* 215. *Line* 18.

" By the 17th Act of the laſt Parliament (be-
" gun 1536, *June* 8th, and ended 1536, *July*
" 18th) it appears that the Biſhoprick of *Nor-*
" *wich* being vacant, the King had recom-
" mended *William*, Abbot of St. *Bennets* to it,
" but took into his own hands all the Lands
" and Manors of the Biſhoprick, and gave
" the Biſhop ſeveral of the Priories in *Norfolk*
" in exchange, which was confirmed in Par-
" liament.

This Act was made in the preceding Parliament, begun 1536, *February* 4th, and diſſolved *April* 14th, and gave to the Biſhoprick of *Norwich* in exchange only the Abbey of St. *Bennets in the Holm*, the Priory of *Hickling* in *Norfolk*, and a Prebend in the Collegiate Church of St. *Stephens* in *Weſtminſter*.

XLI. *Pag.* 235. *lin.* 20.

" The Abbot of *Farneſe* in *Lincolnſhire*, with
" thirty Monks, reſigned up that Houſe to the
" King on the 9th of *April* 1537.

The Abbey of *Furnes* was ſeated in *Lancaſhire*.

Pag.

Pag. 241. *lin.* 45. XLII.

" *Battel Abbey* was repreſented to be a little
" *Sodom*, ſo was *Chriſt-Church* in *Canterbury*,
" with ſeveral other Houſes.

The Hiſtorian doth not tell us, by whom they were thus repreſented. For that would have marred all the Hiſtory, and have relieved the reputation of theſe Monaſteries. Not by the Viſitors ſurely; for the Acts of their Viſitation of theſe places do not remain. The credit of the whole matter reſts upon the authority of a vile Pamphlet publiſhed ſoon after without a Name, pretending to relate the enormous wickedneſſes diſcovered in the Monaſteries of *England* at their ſuppreſſion. From this Pamphlet *Stevens* tranſcribed theſe Stories into his *Apology for Herodotus*, and from him *Fuller* took them into his *Church Hiſtory*, from whom our Hiſtorian received them. But *Fuller* is ſo ingenuous, as to own from whence he took them; and to add, that he thinks it not reaſonable to believe ſuch hainous accuſations upon ſo ſlender teſtimony. We have ſome reaſon to reflect upon the complaint which our Hiſtorian brings againſt Dr. *Heylin*, that *he never vouched any authority for what he writ, which is not to be forgiven any who write of Tranſactions beyond their own Times.* I fear that upon computation it will not be found, that our Author hath vouched any Authority for ſo much as the third part of his Hiſtory; and is eſpecially deficient in thoſe paſſages which tend to defame the Memories of other men; in which above all others Juſtice and Charity would require

Pag. 317.

Pref. p. 2.

quire that ſufficient, or at leaſt ſome teſtimony be produced.

But to return to *Battel Abbey* and *Chriſt Church* in *Canterbury*; I am not much concerned for either. Yet being willing to doe Juſtice to all men, I will not conceal that the accuſation appears very improbable to me as far as *Chriſt Church Canterbury* is concerned in it; ſince I am well aſſured, that *Dr. Goldwell* the Prior of it, who had governed it for 23 years before the Diſſolution, was a learned, grave and religious Perſon: and that when it was founded anew, it is not to be ſuppoſed, that Archbiſhop *Cranmer*, employed by the King therein, would have taken into the new Foundation any perſons ſo ſcandalouſly wicked, yet twelve Monks were taken into it, which exceedeth the number of juſt perſons to be found in *Sodom* at the time of its Deſtruction.

XLIII. *Pag.* 248. *lin.* 37.

"*Edward Fox* Biſhop of *Hereford* died the "8th of *May*, that year, *viz.* 1538.

Biſhop *Godwin* indeed ſaith that *Fox* died that day. But our Hiſtorian pretends *not to take things on truſt eaſily, no not from the greateſt Authors.* The Archbiſhop of *Canterbury* did that day take into his hands the Spiritualties of the See of *Hereford*, void by the death of *Fox*. But his death might, and not probably did, happen ſeveral days before this.

Pag.

Pag. 263. *lin.* 8. XLIV.

" The new Biſhoprick of *Cheſter* was erected " before any others. For I have ſeen a Com- " miſſion under the Privy Seal to the Biſhop of " *Cheſter*, to take the ſurrender of the Mona- " ſtery of *Hamond* in *Shropſhire*, bearing date " the 24th of *Auguſt* this Year, *viz.* 1539. " So it ſeems the See of *Cheſter* was erected " and endowed before the Act paſſed (which " was in *May* 1539.) though there is among " the Rolls a Charter for founding and endow- " ing it afterwards.

From this Paſſage it may appear, how neceſſary it is for any one who undertaketh to write the Hiſtory of our Reformation, to be well acquainted with the State of things before the Reformation. Had this been done, many miſtakes would have been eſcaped, and other Contradictions, which accompany them, would have been avoided. It is here ſaid, that the Commiſſion to the Biſhop of *Cheſter*, for the taking the ſurrender of *Hamond*, was dated the 24th of *Auguſt*; but in the *Collection of Records* it is dated the 31ſt of *Auguſt*. It is ſomewhat unlikely, that a Commiſſion ſhould be given to the new Biſhop of *Cheſter* to take the ſurrender of a Monaſtery in *Shropſhire*, no part of his Dioceſs. Who ſhould this new Biſhop be? It is incredible, that we ſhould have altogether loſt the name and remembrance of a Biſhop, who acted in ſuch a buſie time. The firſt Biſhop of the new Biſhoprick of *Cheſter*, which we can find, was *John Bird*, tranſlated thither from *Bangor*. And of him we know, that the

Pag. 148.

Regist. Cranmer. See of *Bangor* was not void by his Translation to *Chester*, until the beginning of the Year 1542. He therefore could not be that Bishop of *Chester*, to whom the Commission was granted in 1539. I cannot sufficiently wonder, that Mr. *Fulman* should be led into the same mistake; who alloweth the new Bishoprick of *Chester* to have been erected before the making of this Act, but to have been afterwards surrendred, and founded anew. For from the Historian's *Collection of Records* it appears, that the Monastery of St. *Werburge* in *Chester*, (in which the new Bishoprick is founded) was not surrendered till 1540. *January* 20th, which alone overthrows all the Conjectures of the Historian and Mr. *Fulman*. In truth the first Charter for erecting the new Bishoprick of *Chester*, was dated 1541. *July* 16th, but there being some mistake committed therein, a new Charter of Foundation was granted 1541. *August* 5th. (The Historian is mistaken when he puts afterwards *August* 4th.) and *Bird* the first Bishop took Possession in the beginning of the following Year. The Commission therefore granted to the Bishop of *Chester*, for taking the surrender of *Hamond* was directed to the Bishop of *Lichfield* (in whose Diocess it was Seated) which Bishop, until the Division of his Diocess and Erection of a new Bishoprick at *Chester*, was in writing and in common Speech as often called the Bishop of *Chester*, as of *Lichfield*; as is well known to those who are acquainted with the State of the *English* Church before and at the Reformation.

Par. 2. in Append. p. 415.

Pag. 149.

Pag. 300.

Pag.

Pag. 267. *lin.* 1. XLV.

"The Popish party used all the Arts possible, to insinuate themselves into the King. "And therefore to shew how far their Compliance would go, *Bonner* Bishop of *London* "took a strange Commission from the King "on the 12th of *November* this Year 1539. "Whether the other Bishops took such Commissions from the King, I know not. But I "am certain, there is none such in *Cranmers* "Register; and it is not likely, if any such "had been taken out by him, that ever it "would have been razed.——After he had "taken this Commission, *Bonner* might well "have been called one of the *Kings Bishops.*

When the Historian wrote this, surely he little thought that he should publish in the Second part of his History, a like Commission taken from King *Edward* VI. by *Cranmer*. For whosoever compareth the two Commissions, will find that they are not only alike, but the very same, *mutatis mutandis*, only with this difference (as the Historian himself, forgetting what he had here wrote, is forced to own) that there is no mention made of a Vicar General in the Commission of *Edward* VI. to *Cranmer*, as was in that of *Henry* VIII. to *Bonner*, there being none after *Cromwell* advanced to that Dignity. Now it is very injurious to the Memory of *Cranmer*, first to represent this Action of *Bonner*, as a vile unworthy Compliance, and then afterwards to say, that *Cranmer* did the same thing. For what difference is there between taking such a Commission

Par. 2. *in Append. p.* 90.

Par. 2. *p.* 6.

from King *Henry*, and taking the like from King *Edward*; unleſs it be that it ſeemeth ſomewhat more colourable, to take it from a Man than from a Child. Nor can any excuſe be raiſed from the neceſſity impoſed by the Act of Parliament made 1547, *December* 20th, of which an Account is given afterwards. For *Cranmer* had taken out his Commiſſion on the 7th of *Frebruary* preceding. But neither is it true, that *Cranmer* did not take ſuch a Commiſſion from King *Henry* VIII. For the Order of Council, related by the Hiſtorian to have been made in the beginning of the Reign of King *Edward* VI. plainly implyeth the contrary, *requiring the Biſhops to take out new Commiſſions of the ſame Form, with thoſe they had taken out in King* Henry's *time*; in obedience to which Order *Cranmer* took out his Commiſſion before mentioned. If no ſuch Commiſſion taken by *Cranmer* from King *Henry* be now found in his Regiſter, it doth not thence follow, that none was taken by him. For his Regiſter is imperfect in many places. Indeed he took out ſuch a Commiſſion from King *Henry* long before *Bonner*. For in the Collections of Dr. *Yale* (who could not but know the Truth herein, having been in the time of *Cranmer*, an eminent Advocate in *Doctors Commons*, and afterwards principal Regiſtrary and Vicar-General to Archbiſhop *Parker*) I find a Tranſcript of this Commiſſion, agreeing exactly with that of *Bonner* publiſhed by the Hiſtorian, *mutatis mutandis*; and this note ſubjoyned, *Tales licentias acceperunt Thomas Archiepiſcopus Cantuar. menſe* Octobri 1535. *Edwardus Archiep. Eborac. Johannes*

Pag. 43.

Pag. 6.

Johannes Episcopus Lincoln. 13. Octobr. 1535.
Johannes Episcopus London. 19. Octobr. 1535.
Stephanus Episcopus Winton, eodem Anno, Cuthbertus Episcopus Dunelm. 10 Novemb. 1535. &c.

Pag. 268. *lin.* 9. XLVI.

"I will not presume to determin so great a "Point of Law, whether the Abbots sate in "the House of Lords, as being a part of the "Ecclesiastical State, or holding their Lands "of the King by Baronages.

It is the known and avowed Constitution of our Nation, that the Convocation of the Clergy doth constitute the first Estate therein. This being premised, it is manifest, that Bishops, and consequently Abbots also, sate in Convocation as a part of the Ecclesiastical State; and must therefore sit in the House of Lords under some other Quality, which can be no other than that of their Baronage.

Pag. 268. *lin.* 21.

"Generally *Coventry* and *Burton* (*viz.* the XLVII.
"Priory of *Coventry*, and Abbey of *Bur-*
"*ton*) were held by the same man, as one Bi-
"shop held both *Coventry* and *Lichfield*,
"though two different Bishopricks.

I will not take notice of the Historians oversight in making *Coventry* and *Lichfield* two different Bishopricks: for that Mr. *Fulman* had before observed; but of his Error in affirming *Coventry* and *Burton* to have been generally held by the same man. He might with as much

much truth have said, that the Archbishopricks of *Canterbury* and *York* were generally held by the same man. What gave occasion to this enormous mistake, I cannot conceive. *Burton* and *Coventry* were no more related, than any other two Abbeys; neither was one a Cell of the other; nor had the one any Dependance upon the other. At the end of the Annals of *Burton*, Printed some time since at *Oxford*, may be found an exact List of the Abbots of that House from the first Foundation to the Dissolution of it. In *Dugdale's Antiquities of Warwickshire*, may be seen a like Catalogue of the Priors of *Coventry*. If these two be compared, it will be found that from beginning to end, they are made up of different Persons, not so much as any one name of the one Catalogue occurring in the other.

XLVIII *Pag* 300. *lin.* 25.

"Two years after this (*viz.* after *September* 1541) the Abbey of *Osney* in *Oxford*, "was converted into a Bishoprick, a Deanry, "and six Prebends. And the Monastery of "St. *Austins* in *Bristol*, was changed into the "same use.

The Cathedral Church of *Osney* was founded by the King's Charter, dated 1542. *September.* 1. And *Paul Bush* Bishop of *Bristol* was consecrated 1542. *June* 25th. So that the Historian is mistaken, when he referreth the Foundation of both these Bishopricks to the end of the Year 1543.

Pag.

Pag. 300. *lin.* 49. XLIX.

"Then the Priories at moſt Cathedrals, "ſuch as *Canterbury*, *Wincheſter*, *Dureſm*, *Wor-* "*ceſter*, *Carliſle*, *Rocheſter*, and *Ely*, were alſo "converted into Deanries and Colleges of "Prebends.

If *by moſt Cathedrals* are to be underſtood moſt of the Cathedrals of *England*, that is not true. For if to thoſe he had added *Norwich*, he had named all. But if by that Term are to be underſtood moſt of thoſe old Cathedrals, which were founded anew at this time; then it is trifling. For in all the old Cathedrals which were then founded anew, the Priories were thus changed.

Pag. 301. *lin.* 43. L.

"In *England* when the Biſhoprick of *Lin-* "*coln* being judged of too great an extent, the "Biſhoprick of *Ely* was taken out of it; it was "done only by the King with the Conſent of "his Clergy and Nobles. Pope *Nicholas* in- "deed officiouſly intruded himſelf into that "matter by ſending afterwards a Confirmation "of what was done.

The Erection of a new Biſhoprick at *Ely*, was never thought on till the Year 1106, and was compleated in the Year 1109. Pope *Nicholas* II, died in the Year 1061, and Pope *Nicholas* III, obtained the Papacy in 1277. We deſire to know, which of theſe two the Hiſtorian meaneth. Not the former ſurely. But neither did the latter, any more than the for-

mer, concern himſelf in a matter done ſo long before his time. It was Pope *Paſchal* II, whoſe Bulls of Confirmation were pretended to have been ſent immediately after the Erection of the Biſhoprick. But even thoſe ſeem to have been forged.

LI. *Pag.* 316. *lin.* 44.

" In the time of Popery there had been few " Sermons but in Lent.

If he ſpeaks of the ancient times of Popery, it may be true. But for ſome time before the Reformation Preaching ſeems to have been more frequent, in *England*. For Dr. *Lichfield* Rector of *All-Saints* in *Thames Street*, *London*, who died in the Year 1447, left behind him 3083. Sermons wrote with his own hand, and preached at ſeveral times by him. All theſe Sermons could not be preached in Lent. After him we have the Examples of *Bradley* the Suffragan Biſhop of *Norwich*, who died in the Year 1492. after he had ſpent many years in travelling about that Dioceſs, and Preaching in it: of Dr. *Colet* Dean of S. *Pauls*, who conſtantly preached or expounded the Scriptures either in his own, or in ſome other Church of the City; of Dr. *Collingwood* Dean of *Lichfield*, who preached in that Cathedral every Sunday for many years together. The Practice ſeemeth not to have been unfrequent long before this time, and in ſome places to have been commanded to all the Pariſh-Prieſts. For in the Conſtitutions of *John de Thoresby* Archbiſhop of *York*, made about the Year 1360. I found

a

a Command to all the Parochial Clergy to preach frequently to their People, and explain to them the Articles of Faith in the *English* Tongue; and an Exhortation directed to the People, *tohere Goddys Service every Soneday with Reverence and Devocionn, and seye devowtly thy* Pater-Noster, *&c. and here Goddys Lawe taught in thy Modyr Tonge. For that is bettyr than to here many Massys.*

Pag. 328. *lin.* 37. LII.

" Dr. *Lee* Dean of *York*, was brought up a-
" bout *All-hallow-tide* in the Year 1543. and
" sent into *Kent*, (So also *Append. pag.* 292. *lin.*
" 38.) *Leighton* brought in *Lee* to be a Visitor
" of the Monasteries, but they were of the
" Popish party, and *Lee* was *Cranmer's* Friend.
" He was in Orders, and soon after (the Visi-
" tation of Monasteries performed by him) was
" made Dean of *York*.

Lee was never Dean of *York*. For *Higden* who was made Dean in 1516, died in 1537. To him succeeded Dr. *Layton* (for so his name is to be wrote, not *Leighton*, for he was no *Scot*) who died in the Year 1544, and was succeeded by Dr. *Wotton*, who died in the Reign of Queen *Elizabeth*.

Pag. 333. *lin.* 24. LIII.

" *Bell*, that was Bishop of *Worcester* had re-
" signed his Bishoprick, the former year (viz.
" in the Year 1544) the Bishop of *Rochester*,
" *Heath*, was translated to that See.—And
" upon the Translation of *Sampson* from *Chi-*
cester

" ceſter to *Litchfield*, *Day* was made Biſhop of " that See.

Reziſt. Cranmer. *Bell* had reſigned his Biſhoprick in the Year 1543. For *Heath* was Elected to ſucceed him *December* 22. 1543. *Sampſon's* Tranſlation preceded even that of *Heath*; for *Day* was Elected to *Chicheſter* void by his Tranſlation, *April* 24. 1543.

LIV. *Pag.* 337. *lin.* 14.

" None of the Preachers were either Actors " or Conſenters to the murder of Cardinal " *Beaton.*——I do not find that any of them " juſtified it.

Knox gave a violent Suſpicion of his conſenting to it, and juſtifying it; when the Murderers, being immediately after the murder committed beſieged in the Caſtle, he conveyed himſelf in among them, and became their Chaplain. The Author of *the Hiſtory of the Church of* Scotland, which paſſeth under *Knox* his Name, extolls the murder, as a Noble and Heroical Action. If *Knox* were not, yet at leaſt one of the *Scotch* Preachers was, the Author of this Hiſtory. There is no Villany of this kind, ſo black, which may not be believed of *Scotch* Presbyterians; ſince they have in our days as inhumanely murdered another Archbiſhop of St. *Andrews*, and juſtifyed it, and commended it as a meritorious Action.

Pag.

Pag. 349. *lin.* 35. LV.

" This leads me to discover many things " concerning the Will of King *Henry* VIII. " which have been hitherto unknown. I draw " them from a Letter written by *Maitland* of " *Leithington*, Secretary of State to the Queen of " *Scotland*. The design of it is to clear the " right his Mistress had to the Crown of *Eng-* " *land*.—— Therein he proveth King *Henry*'s " Will to be a Forgery, because it was not sign- " ed with the King's own Hand, but those about " him put the Stamp to it, when they saw his " Death approaching. For this he appealed " to the Deposition of the Lord *Paget*; and " desired the Marquess of *Winchester*, &c. " Dr. *Buts*, and some others, might be exami- " ned. Thus it appears what vulgar Errors " pass upon the World.

Here the Historian maketh great Ostentation of his own performance, imagining that he hath entirely overthrown the Credit of all our *English* Histories, and convicted the *English* Nation of a blind credulity. But we beg leave to put in our Exceptions. *Maitland*, as Secretary to the Queen of *Scotland*, might do well to urge any Argument tending to the Service of his Mistress, whether true or false. But what is allowable to a States-man herein, is not to an Historian. It is manifest, that *Maitland* was ill informed in one Circumstance; and if so, all the rest may be suspected, as being received from the same Authority. For he affirms Dr. *Buts*, the Kings Physician, to have been present at his Death; when the Stamp

was

Par. 2. Addend. p. 416.

was ſet to the Will. Now Dr. *Buts* died 1545. 17th. *November*, as his Epitaph in the Church at *Fulham* teſtifieth. But King *Henry* died not till the 28th *January* $154\frac{6}{7}$ (not $154\frac{7}{8}$, as the Inſcription under his Picture, prefixed to this Hiſtory beareth.) So that the whole Story alledged by *Maitland*, may be as much *a Forgery*, as King *Henry*'s Will is by the Hiſtorian ſaid to be.

LVI.

Pag. 353. *lin.* 37.

"But if he (*Fiſher* Biſhop of *Rocheſter*) had "kept his opinion of the King's Supremacy to "to himſelf, they could not have proceeded "farther. He would not do that, but did upon "ſeveral Occaſions ſpeak againſt it: ſo he was "brought to his Tryal. *The Hiſtorian doth more than once inſiſt upon this.*

I am very unwilling to deliver any thing without preſent Evidence, yet I do very well remember, that ſome years ſince I ſaw in writing a Complaint of Biſhop *Fiſher's*, declaring the unhandſome dealing of thoſe, who from time to time were ſent by the King to diſcourſe with him in Priſon: how that having urged him to declare his Reaſons againſt the King's Supremacy, and aſſured him that in ſo doing he ſhould receive no prejudice; they obtained of him to do it, and then made uſe of ſuch his Declaration to his Deſtruction; grounding their Teſtimony of his Recuſancy upon it.

Pag.

LVII.

Pag. 358. *lin.* 8.

" Thus died *John Fiſher* Biſhop of *Rocheſter*, " in the 80th. Year of his Age.

George Lilly, who knew him well, and wrote his *Life*, ſaith that he was born in the Year 1459. He was beheaded in the middle of the Year 1535. ſo that his Age did not then exceed 76 years.

LVIII.

Pag. 356 *lin.* 49.

" *Makerel* the Monk, that firſt raiſed the " *Lincolnſhire* Rebellion, was with Sixteen more " indicted of High Treaſon.

Dr. *Makerel* might have deſerved ſome higher Title than that of plain *Monk*. For he was Abbot of *Barlings*, and had been many years Suffragan Biſhop in the Dioceſs of *Lincoln*.

LIX.

Pag. 361. *lin.* 48.

" This Year, (1540.) *Sampſon* Biſhop of " *Chicheſter* was put in the *Tower*, upon Suſpi- " cion of Correſpondence with the Pope.

The Hiſtorian would have done well to have produced his Teſtimony, when he charged the Biſhop with this Crime. *Godwin* ſaith, that he was impriſoned for relieving with money the neceſſities of ſome poor Priſoners, who had been impriſoned for denying the King's Supremacy. The ſame alſo *Fabian*, *Hall*, and *Stow*, affirm in their Hiſtories. Now great difference is to be made between holding Correſpondence

respondence with the Pope, and relieving others imprisoned for it. The first would have been unpardonable Treachery, after so many Pretensions and Engagements to the contrary. But the latter might only have been an effect of his Charity to distressed Persons.

LX. *Addenda. pag. 291. lin. 1.*

"*Sanders* had said, that the King (*Henry*) "made many write Apologies for what he "did; which some did willingly, being tainted "with Heresie; others unwillingly, and for "fear, as *Gardiner*, and *Tonstall*. For this the "Historian is angry with *Sanders*, and saith, "that indeed *Gardiner* was a man like enough "to write any thing that might please the "King; but *Tonstall* was a man of greater "probity, than to have done so unworthy "a thing upon any Account whatsoever.

When *Sanders* speaks in favour of the Reformation, he is not rashly to be disbelieved. I esteem it no small Honour to our Cause, that so excellent a Person as *Tonstall* once wrote in defence of it. I much desired therefore that it might be true; and upon search found it to be so. For to omit the Testimony of *Bale*, who reckons amongst *Tonstall's* writings, a Book *against the Supremacy of the Pope*, I have seen and read a long Sermon of *Tonstall's*, preached before K. *Henry* on *Palm-Sonday*, and Printed *London*, 1633, in 4to, in which he inveigheth largely against the Primacy of the Pope, and the Treason of *Reginald Pole* then Cardinal. It should seem that this Sermon was published even in the

De Scriptor. Brit. p. 714.

the time of *Tonstall's* Life. For I find it cited by the Author of the *Defence of Priests Marriages* wrote in the Reign of Queen *Mary*. The Author of *Athenæ Oxonienses* saith, that it was Printed in *London* 1539. who farther adds, that he wrote a Letter to Cardinal *Pole* against the Supremacy of the Pope, Printed at *London* 1560, and 1579. *Quarto*. Pag. 193. & 214.

Pag. 316. *lin.* 15. LXI.

"The Abbots writ generally so ill, that it "is very hard to read their Subscriptions: "Some of them I could by no means know "what to make of.

If the Historian intended hereby to Arraign the Abbots of Illiterature; let it be remembred, that himself had before said of King *Henry*, *That he was the most learned Prince, that had been in the World for many Ages*, and yet that he *never wrote well, but scrawled so that his hand was scarce Legible*. But not to make Inferences for the Historian; let us only consider his own Words. He complains that he could not read all the Subscriptions of the Abbots by reason of the badness of their hands. We are willing to allow any excuse to him, unless wherein he reflects upon the Memory of others. For that is not fair. Any one who compareth his Transcript with the Original, would judge, that neither could he read the Subscriptions of the Secular Clergy of the lower House of Convocation. For in his Copy many of their Names are miserably corrupted, and mistaken. The truth is, all of them might with- Par. 2. p. 10, 11.

out

out much difficulty have been read, and exactly transcribed; if the Historian had not read, as well (as others say he wrote) in Post-haste. I will therefore conclude this First Part, with subjoyning the Names of those Abbots and Priors, whose Titles the Historian could not read.

Henricus Abbas de Gratiis,
Thomas Abbas de Gerendon,
Johannes Prior de Newenham,
Richardus Abbas de Bruera.

Pars Secunda.

Pag. 10. *lin.* 36. 1.

" *Alcuinus*, a moſt learned Countreyman " of ours.

IF by *Countreyman* is here to be underſtood a *Scot*, the Hiſtorian would never have aſſerted *Alcuinus* to be his Countreyman, had he not preſumed very much upon the ignorance of the *Engliſh* Nation, and ſuppoſed that in knowledge of Antiquity we were got no farther, than we were in the time of *Hector Boethius*, when ſuch Fables as this, (that *Achaius* King of *Scotland* ſent *Alcuinus*, *Rabanus Maurus*, &c. to *Charles* the *Great*,) might be ſecurely vended. *Alcuinus* himſelf in his Epiſtle to the Emperour *Charles*, calleth *York* his Countrey; and ſaith, that he was educated there under *Egbert* the Archbiſhop: *Date mihi exquiſitioris eruditionis Scholaſticæ libellos, quales in patriâ habui, per bonam & devotiſſimam magiſtri mei Egberti Archiepiſcopi induſtriam*: And in his Poem concerning the *Archbiſhops and Saints of the Church of York*, hath theſe Verſes, Malmsbur. *de geſt. Pontif. fol.* 153.

Patriæ quondam mens dicere laudes Pag. 703.
Et veteres cunas properat proferre parumper, 732.
Euboricæ gratis præclaræ verſibus urbis.

Utpote quæ proprium ſibi me nutrivit alumnum,
Imbuit & primis utcunque verenter ab annis.

When equal Evidence ſhall be produced, that *Alcuinus* was born or bred in *Scotland*; we ſhall allow him to have been the Hiſtorian's *Countryman*.

II. *Pag.* 24. *lin.* 35.

" By an Act made in King *Henry* the 8th's " time, none might hold two Benefices with- " out a Diſpenſation; but no Diſpenſation " could enable one to hold three.

The contrary of this appears from the Regiſter of Faculties granted by Archbiſhop *Parker*: wherein may be found very many Diſpenſations of triality of Benefices with cure of Souls, enabling the Grantee to hold any third Living with two, or any two with one, already poſſeſſed; or to hold any three, hereafter to be obtained.

III. *Pag.* 24. *lin.* 39.

" While the Abbies ſtood, the Abbots al- " lowed thoſe, whom they appointed to ſerve " the Cure in the Churches that belonged to " them, a ſmall Stipend, or ſome little part of " the Vicarage-tithes.

The caſe of Vicars was not ſo bad before the Reformation, as after. Before it the Fees of Sacraments, Sacramentals, *Dirige's*, &c. were very great, ſince very inconſiderable. Before the Reformation, Biſhops could from time to time encreaſe their Allowance out of the Tithes of the Benefice, in what proportion they pleaſed, even beyond the firſt dotation of it. The Biſhops indeed have the ſame right

ſtill,

still, as Dr. *Ryves* hath fully proved; but the interposition of the Common Law would now hinder the execution of it. The Vicars then were not left to the pleasure of the Abbot or Religious House, to whom the Church belonged. But the Bishops endowed the Vicarages with what proportion of Tithes and Emoluments they thought fit; in many places reserved to the Vicar one half of all manner of Tithes, and the whole Fees of all Sacraments, Sacramentals, *&c.* in most places reserved to them, not some little part of, but all the Vicarage-tithes, and in other places appointed to them an annual pension of Money. In succeeding times when the first Endowments appeared too slender, they encreased them at their pleasure. Of all which our ancient Registers and Records give abundant testimony. This was the case of all Vicarages. As for those impropriated Livings, which have now no settled Endowment, and are therefore called not Vicarages, but perpetual or sometimes arbitrary Curacies; they are such as belonged formerly to those Orders, who could serve the cure of them in their own persons, as the Canons Regular of the Order of St. *Austin*; which being afterwards devolved into the hands of Laymen, they hired poor Curates to serve them, at the cheapest rate they could, and still continue to doe so. Vicar's Plea.

Pag. 25. *lin.* 28. IV.

"*Ridley* elect of *Rochester*, designed for that "See by King *Henry*, but not consecrated till "*September* this Year 1547.

If King *Henry* designed *Ridley* to be Bishop of *Rochester*, he could not do it by any actual Nomination, but only by Prophetical foresight of *Longland's* Death, and *Holbeach's* Translation. For the King died 1547, *January* 28th. *Longland* of *Lincoln* died 1547. *May* 7th. *Holbeach* of *Rochester* was elected to *Lincoln* 9th. *August*. So that until *August* there was no room for *Ridley* at *Rochester*.

V. *Pag.* 30. *lin.* 17.

"The Form of bidding Prayer was used in "the times of Popery, as will appear by the "Form of *bidding the Beads* in King *Henry* the "7th's time; which will be found in the Col-"lection.

The Form published by the Historian out of the Festival, Printed *Anno* 1509. seemeth by the length of it, and comparing it with another undoubtedly true Form, to have been rather a Paraphrase or Exposition of the Form of bidding Beads. I have therefore presented to the Reader a much shorter and ancienter Form, taken out of an old-written Copy. *Collect. numb.* 2.

VI. *Pag.* 32. *lin.* 13.

"*Tonstall* searching the Registers of his See, "found many Writings of great consequence "to clear the Subjection of the Crown of *Scot-"land* to *England*.——The most remarkable "of these, was the Homage King *William* of "*Scotland* made to *Henry* the Second, by which "he granted, that all the Nobles of his Realm "should be his Subjects, and do Homage to "him; and that all the Bishops of *Scotland* should

" ſhould be under the Archbiſhop of *York*.——
" It was ſaid, that the Monks in thoſe days,
" who generally kept the Records, were ſo ac-
" cuſtomed to the forging of Stories, and Wri-
" tings; that little Credit was to be given to
" ſuch Records, as lay in their keeping. But
" having ſo faithfully acknowledged what was
" alledged againſt the Freedom of *Scotland*, I
" may be allowed to ſet down a Proof on the
" other ſide, for my Native Countrey, copied
" from the Original Writing yet extant under
" the Hands and Seals of many of the Nobi-
" lity and Gentry of that Kingdom. It is a
" Letter to the Pope, *&c.*

The ancient and allowed Laws of Hiſtory exclude Partiality, yet this Hiſtorian's great Concern for the Honour of his Countrey cannot well be called by any other name; which hath induced him to publiſh an Inſtrument of the Nobility and Gentry of *Scotland*, not at all relating to the Hiſtory of our *Engliſh* Reformation. If he thinketh that this Liberty ought to be allowed to him in recompence of the great Obligation he hath laid upon the *Engliſh* Nation for having *ſo faithfully acknowledged what was alledged againſt the Freedom of Scotland*; we pretend, that all Perſons converſant in the Hiſtory of our Nation, did before this very well know all theſe Allegations, and ten times as many of no leſs weight; and that either he did not perfectly underſtand the Controverſie, or hath not ſo faithfully repreſented the Arguments of our ſide. For King *William* did not herein make any new Grant to King *Henry*,

but only confirmed and acknowledged the ancient Dependence and Subjection of *Scotland* to *England*; nor did he then first subject the Bishops of *Scotland* to the Archbishop of *York*, but engaged that hereafter they should be subject to him, *as of right they ought to be, and had wont to be in the time of the former Kings of* England. The Bishops of *Scotland* had been all along subject to the Archbishops of *York*; but having about Eleven years before this obtained an Exemption of this Jurisdiction by a Bull of Pope *Alexander*; the King of *Scotland* now undertook, that they should not claim the benefit of that Exemption, but be subject to the Church of *England*, as formerly; and the Bishops of *Scotland* also then present concurred with the King, and promised for themselves: although within a short time after they broke their Faith, and procured a new and fuller Exemption from the Pope; which *Dempster* placeth in the Year 1178. The Charter of King *William* before mentioned was made in 1175. But after all the Bishoprick of *Galloway* continued to be subject unto the Archbishop of *York*, until towards the end of the Fifteenth Century, when it was by the Pope taken from *York*, and subjected to *Glasgow*, then newly erected into an Archbishoprick. Now, whereas the Historian would invalidate the Authority of this Charter, insinuating that it may justly be suspected to have been forged by the Monks, because taken out of their Records, and coming out of their Custody; he may please to know, that this very Charter may be found entire in the Printed History of

Roger

Roger de Hoveden; who was no Monk, but a a Secular Clergy-man, a Domeſtick of this King *Henry*, attending him in all his Expeditions. As for the pretence of the Nobility and Gentry of *Scotland*, in their Letter written to the Pope *Anno* 1320. and publiſhed by the Hiſtorian; it is not to be wondered, if their minds being elated with unuſual Succeſs againſt our unfortunate King *Edward* II. they enlarged their Pretences, and affected an independency from the Crown of *England*, which their Forefathers never pretended to, nor had themſelves at any other time dared to arrogate. All the principal Nobility and Gentry of *Scotland*, had in the Year 1291, made as ample and authentick an Inſtrument of the Subjection of the Crown of *Scotland* to *England*, as could be conceived, before *Edward* had either Conquered, or invaded their Countrey: which Inſtrument *Tonſtall* taketh notice of in his Memorial; and this was indeed the moſt remarkable of all the Teſtimonies produced by *Tonſtall*; at leaſt accounted by King *Edward* to be of ſo great moment, that he ſent a Copy of it under the Great Seal, to every noted Abbey and Collegiate Church in *England*, that it might be ſafely preſerved, and inſerted into their ſeveral Annals. It may be ſeen at length in the Printed Hiſtory of *Matthew Weſtminſter*. Therein it may be obſerved, that it was ſubſcribed by ſome of thoſe very Noblemen of *Scotland*, who ſubſcribed the Letter to the Pope, publiſhed by the Hiſtorian; who may be thought therein to have done no great Honour to his Countrey, by publiſh-

ing ſuch an Authentick Teſtimony of the Infidelity of it.

VII. *Pag.* 47, 48, 49.

"When the Parliament was divided into "two Houſes, then the Clergy made likewiſe "a Body of their own, and ſate in "Convocation, which was the third Eſtate---- "Whether ever the Clergy were a part of the "Houſe of Commons, is a juſt doubt.——Up- "on the whole matter, it is not certain, what "was the Power or Right of theſe Proctors "of the (inferior) Clergy in former times. "Some are of opinion, that they were only "Aſſiſtants to the Biſhops, but had no voice "in either Houſe of Parliament.——But as "the Clauſe *Præmonentes* in the Writ, ſeems to "make them a part of the Parliament; ſo "theſe Petitions ſuppoſe that they ſate in the "Houſe of Commons anciently.——In a "matter ſo perplexed and dark, I will preſume "to offer a Conjecture, which will not appear "perhaps improbable. In the 129th Page of "the former Part, I gave the Reaſons that "made me think the lower Houſe of Con- "vocation conſiſted at firſt only of the Pro- "ctors of the Clergy. It is generally believed "that the whole Parliament ſate together "in one Houſe before *Edward* the Third's "time; and then the inferiour Clergy were a "a part of that without queſtion. But when "the Lords and Commons ſate apart, the "Clergy likewiſe ſate in two Houſes.---- "So that it ſeems to me moſt probable, that "the Proctors of the Clergy were both

"in

" in *England* and *Ireland*, the lower Houſe of " Convocation.

I will not here enter into an exact Enquiry concerning the ancient Conſtitution of Parliaments in *England*. A queſtion, which hath already exerciſed ſo many Learned Pens, cannot be diſpatched in few words. I will only obſerve, that the Hiſtorian hath ſucceeded very ill in his Conjectures. In the firſt place it is a wide miſtake to affirm, that after the Diviſion of the Houſes, and perfect Settlement of the Conſtitution of Parliament, the Convocation was the third Eſtate. For it was anciently accounted, and was really the firſt Eſtate. Then his Conjecture concerning the ancient Seat of the Proctors of the Clergy in Parliament, deduced with ſo much Labour, ſo many previous and concomitant Obſervations, is unhappily founded upon two falſe Suppoſitions. The firſt is, That formerly the lower Houſe of Convocation conſiſted only of the Proctors of the Clergy. The contrary of this was fully proved in the preceding Papers; wherein it was ſhewn, that Deans alſo, and Archdeacons, did ſit in the lower Houſe of Convocation. The ſecond falſe Suppoſition is, that until *Edward* the Third's time, the whole Parliament ſate together in one Houſe, and conſequently that the ſeveral Eſtates of Parliament were then alike ſummoned by the Kings Writ. Now the contrary of this appears from an ancient Remonſtrance of the Clergy in Convocation in the Year 1314. found in an Authentick Regiſter, the ſumm and occaſion of which

which I will represent in few words. The King had issued out a Writ to *Walter* Archbishop of *Canterbury*, *Die* 27. *Martii*, *Anno Regni Septimo*, in this Form.——*Vobis mandamus, quatenus sitis in propriâ personâ vestrâ apud Westmonasterium in crastino Ascensionis Domini proximo futuro, coram fidelibus nostris ad hoc deputandis, ad tractandum cum eisdem fidelibus nostris super competenti auxilio à Clero Provinciæ vestræ Cant. nobis impendendo, pro utilitate Reipublicæ*, &c. *prout in proximo Parliamento apud Westmonasterium habito, tam per Clerum, quàm per Communitatem regni nostri extitit concordatum; & prout per prædictos fideles nostros eritis requisiti. Et ad eundem diem venire faciatis coram dictis fidelibus nostris Suffraganeos vestros, Decanos, Abbates*, &c. *& Clerum cujusque Diocesis ejusdem Provinciæ per duos Procuratores sufficientes; ad tractandum & consentiendum unà Vobiscum his quæ in præmissis ibidem contigerit ordinari.* In obedience to this Writ, (which is Entituled *Litera de Convocatione Cleri apud Westm.*) the Archbishop sent a Mandate to his Suffragans, *&c.* in such Form, as repeating at length the Kings Writ, he subjoyned: *Quocirca vobis tenore præsentium injungimus & mandamus; quatenus vos dictis die & loco interfitis*, &c. From hence it appears, that the Clergy were even before this called immediately to Convocation by the Archbishops Writ; and that in the preceding Parliament the Clergy and *Communitas Regni* sate apart. But this is not all. When the Clergy met upon this Mandate of the Archbishop, they presented to him a Remonstrance, excepting against the form

form of the King's Summons and his Mandate. *Contra formam hujuſmodi citationis Clerus Cant. Provinciæ propoſuit rationes ſubſcriptas die Lunæ in craſtino S. Dunſtani apud Weſtm. &c. Imprimis*, That whereas the Clergy of the Province of *Canterbury* had not been wont nor ought to be called by the King's Authority: This Mandate of the Archbiſhop proceeded in virtue of the King's command, as appeared by the Form thereof, which had never before been done. That if this Precedent were allowed without any Contradiction, the King might ſend out hereafter like Writs, to the great prejudice of the Church and Clergy. That the King might by the ſame reaſon ſummon them to meet at ſome place out of the Province, which would be prejudicial to the Clergy of the Province, and had been hitherto without Example. That they were herein ſummoned to meet at *Weſtminſter, locum videlicet exemptum auctoritate Ordinarii, ad quem Clerus Cant. Provinciæ ante hæc tempora vocari nullatenus conſuevisſet.* That whereas Laymen had nothing to doe to intermeddle with Eccleſiaſtical cauſes and perſons, this Writ ſummoned them to appear *coram dilectis & fidelibus Domini noſtri Regis nullâ authoritate eccleſiaſticâ fulſitis*, contrary to the uſage of all former times. For theſe and many other Reaſons, they deſired that this Writ ſhould be revoked, and themſelves diſmiſſed, and be ſummoned again in the uſual and legal form. Accordingly they were diſmiſſed on the *Wedneſday* following, and were ſummoned by a new Mandate of the Archbiſhop dated *June* 6. in ſuch Form as was wont to be heretofore uſed,

used, to meet at the Church of St. *Pauls London*, on the 8th of *July*. Which Form, *mutatis mutandis*, agreeth exactly with the Form used immediately before the Reformation, and published by the Historian among the Memorials of the first Part. On the first day of *December* the same year the King summoned another Parliament to meet at *Westminster* in the Octaves of *Hilary*, and directed a Writ to the Archbishop to summon the Clergy to meet *dictis die & loco:* which the Archbishop did. When the Clergy were met, they protested against the Form of the Summons, because cited *ad curiam Sæcularem, puta Domini Regis Parliamentum, quod in camerâ ejusdem Domini fuit inchoatum*; that this was contrary to the ancient Form, and that therefore they would not proceed to act, unless they might be assured, that this should not be drawn into a President, and that for the future the old Form should be observed. Which assurance being given to them, the Clergy granted a Subsidy apart to the King, upon Conditions by them mentioned. From this it should appear, that before the time of *Edward* III. the Convocations of the Provinces of *Canterbury* and *York* were not held out of the several Provinces, and consequently that the Clergy of both did not meet together, and with the Laymen constitute one Body in one House of Parliament; that the Clergy of the Province of *Canterbury* were then summoned by Writs of the same Form as afterwards; that not the King, but the Archbishop, appointed the time and place; that they never sat at *Westminster*, where the

Pag. 6.

other

other Eſtates of Parliament were at that time wont to ſit; that they permitted not Laymen to entermeddle in their Conſultations, but ſate apart from them, and granted Subſidies apart; and all this, as themſelves alledge, had been done, *à tempore cujus memoria non exiſtit.*

VIII.

Pag. 56. *lin.* 8.

"The Clerks of Council did not then enter every thing with that Exactneſs that is "ſince uſed.

It had been more cautious in the Hiſtorian to have ſaid, that he could not find ſuch exact Entries made by them. For I find an Order of Council made 1550. *April* 19th, and entred in the beginning of a large Original Book containing the Acts of Council for the laſt four years of King *Edward* 6th, that *there ſhall be a Clerk attendant upon the ſaid Council, to Write, Enter, and Regiſter all ſuch Decrees, Determinations, and other things, as he ſhould be appointed to enter, in a Book to remain always as a Leger, as well for the diſcharge of the ſaid Counſellors, touching ſuch things as they ſhall paſs from time to time, as alſo for a Memorial unto them of their own proceedings. Unto which Office* William Thomas *was appointed by the Kings Highneſs, with the advice of his aforeſaid Council, and in Preſence of the ſame Council ſworn.* Accordingly all the Acts of Council are therein entred largely and with great exactneſs, the Originall hands of the Privy Councellors then preſent being added to the Acts and Orders of every ſeveral day. This Book I ſhall often mention hereafter.

Pag.

IX. *Pag.* 71. *lin.* 1. & 36.

"The next thing *Cranmer* set about, was the "compiling of a *Catechism*, or institution of "young Persons, in the Grounds of the Chri-"stian Religion——— a work which was wholly his own, without the Concurrence of any "others.

In truth *Cranmer* only translated this *Catechism* out of *Dutch* (at least translated it from the *Latin* Translation of *Justus Jonas*, who had translated the *Dutch* Catechism) as both the Title and the Preface of it might have informed the Historian. The Title saith, it *was overseen and corrected* by the Archbishop; and *Cranmer* himself in another Book speaketh of this *Catechism* in these words——— *a Catechism by me translated and set forth.* He added indeed a large Discourse of his own to the Exposition of the Second Commandment, and inserted some few Sentences elsewhere.

Treatise of the Sacrament, f. 100.

X. *Pag.* 89. *lin.* 29.

"The people had been more prejudiced a-"gainst the Marriage of the Clergy; if they "had not felt greater Inconveniences by the "Debaucheries of Priests; who being restrai-"ned from Marriage, had defiled the Beds and "deflowred the Daughters of their Neigh-"bours, *&c.*

As for Adulteries and Rapes (which the Historian insisteth on) it is charitably to be hoped, that they were not so frequent in the Clergy before the Reformation. But the greatest

teſt Scandal aroſe by keeping Women in their Houſes under the Name and Notion of Concubines, and being Licenſed by their ſeveral Biſhops to do it: which abuſe obtained generally, and was practiſed openly, throughout the whole Weſtern Church immediately before the Reformation. Yet in any caſe to cover the faults of the Clergy, and to excuſe them where the cauſe admitteth any excuſe, not only the reſpect due to the ſacred Order, but common Juſtice alſo requireth. Had all theſe Women, thus generally entertained by the Clergy, been no other than their Concubines; it would indeed have been inexcuſable. But in truth, they were for the moſt part their Wives; whom they married ſecretly, and kept under the name of Concubines: ſince the Laws and Canons then received, forbad them to Marry openly, or to entertain Women under the name of Wives. This the Biſhops very well knew: and from time to time gave them Licenſes to do it, and tolerated them in it; not allowing them thereby to violate the Divine Laws of Chaſtity, but only in ſecret to neglect the Eccleſiaſtical Laws of Celibacy. Now that this was the caſe of the Weſtern Clergy, we are aſſured by *Alvarus Pelagius*,* †*Caſſander*, and others. And leſt we ſhould imagine the Clergy of *England* in this practiſe to have Acted, either with leſs Wit or Conſcience than the Clergy of other Nations; we find ſeveral Conſtitutions of our latter Provincial Councils directed againſt the Clandeſtine Marriages of the Clergy. Theſe Conſtitutions were made for ſhew; but were ſeldom or never executed.

* *Planct. Eccl. l.* 2.
† *Conſultat.* 23.

cuted. But the moſt expreſs Teſtimony, that can be deſired herein, is given by Archbiſhop *Parker*; who publiſhing a large and accurate *Defence of Prieſts Marriages*, wrote by an Anonymous Layman in the Reign of Queen *Mary*; hath towards the end of the Book, in ſome Copies of it, inſerted ten Sheets of his own Compoſition, wherein he giveth a full and learned Hiſtory of the Marriage and Celibacy of the Clergy of *England*, from the firſt Reception of Chriſtianity to the Reformation. In this Hiſtory he affirms the practiſe of the Clergy in Relation to Concubines before mentioned, to have continued all along in *England*, concluding thus,—*And ſo lived ſecretlye with their Friendes, not openly vouched for Wives, but in* affectu ſororio, amore uxorio, & fide conjugali, *as they uſe the Tearmes. In which kynde of Lyfe there be no ſmall Argumentes, that ſome Biſhoppes, and the beſt of the Cleargie, lyvyng within the Memorie of man, dyd continue.* And in another place: *For as many of the Cleargie lyved in Adulteries, and ſome in Vices Sodomitical; ſo dyd diverſe, whoſe Conſciences were better, and in knowledge more wiſe, lyved ſecretlie with Wives, and provyded for their Children under the Names of Nephews, and other mens Children.*——*In which manner lyved* Boniſacius *Archbiſhope of* Canterbury, *and other Biſhopes of old dayes; but ſome alſo of late dayes dyd lyve, though all the World did not barke at the matter.*

Pag. 329.

Pag. 334.

Before I diſmiſs this matter, I will add ſomewhat concerning the Attempt made for the open Reſtitution of Marriage to the Clergy in the times of *Henry* 8th, of which our Hiſtori-

an

ah is altogether silent. The Anonymous Author of the *Defence of Priests Marriages* before mentioned, relateth, that after it had been enacted by Statute 27 *H.* 8. That all Licenses, Dispensations, and Faculties obtained of the Archbishop of *Canterbury*, in matters not repugnant or contrary to the Holy Scriptures and Laws of God, should stand in full Authority and Strength, without any repeal to be hereafter had of any such Licenses; divers Priests obtained Dispensations of Marriages; some of which were corroborated by the King's Broad Seal, and some by the Archbishop's Seal only. *Afterwards the King understanding, that certain in his Realm were married, as well Regulars as Seculars, without Authority and Common Laws*, did (through the instigation of the Popish party) make an open Proclamation (which may be found in the following Collection) *in the 30th Year of his Reign; wherein he did but for afterward charge, that no man should attempt the same again; and did not dissolve those Marriages being so privately contracted.* In the following year indeed (the Popish party still prevailing more at Court) the Six Articles were enacted; by which such Marriages were dissolved, and many Persons so married were divorced. But after all *the King knew by Information of a good number from time to time; and yet did both tolerate the same, which were used secretly; and such as were openly known did not separate them, but commanded them to be reputed as Lay-Persons,——and would have granted Liberty to all in his days, but for some certain Zealous Councellors; as was not unknown*

Pag. 173. 197, 198.

Num. 9.

to divers, who heard him oft ſpeak of that matter.

XI. *Pag.* 90. *lin.* 13.

" Many great Biſhops in theſe times (the " fourth and fifth Ages) lived ſtill with their " Wives, and had Children by them; as name- " ly *Nazianzen*'s, and *Baſil*'s Fathers; and " *Hilary* of *Poictiers*, when very old, writing " to his Daughter *Abra*, bid her ask her Mo- " ther, *&c.*

Nazianzen's Father was certainly a Biſhop, and begat him after his Conſecration. But that *Baſil*'s Father was a Biſhop, appeareth not. Some later Writers indeed have affirmed it, without any ground from ancient Writers; but that he ſtill lived with his Wife, and had Children, neither later nor ancient Writers mention. The like may be ſaid of *Hilary*. The Epiſtle to his Daughter *Abra*, the only foundation of his ſuppoſed Marriage, is generally allowed by Critics to be ſpurious. The Hiſtorian may here perhaps defend himſelf by alledging, that he doth not in this place propoſe his own arguments, but only the reaſons upon which our Reformers proceeded in reſtoring Marriage to the Clergy. I do acknowledge, that theſe miſtakes are found in moſt of their Writings concerning the Marriage of the Clergy publiſhed at that time. But then we have juſt reaſon to complain, that it is injurious to the Honour of our Reformers to chooſe, from among ſo many irrefragable arguments and authorities propoſed and urged by them in this cauſe, ſuch as are miſtakes, or at leaſt liable to exception.

Pag.

Pag. 90. *lin.* 21. XII.

"*Heliodorus* Biſhop of *Trica* did firſt move, "that Clergymen ſhould be obliged to live "ſingle.

The Hiſtorian is too well converſant in the Hiſtory of the ancient Church, not to know, that (long before the time of *Heliodorus*) ſome Biſhops moved in the great Council of *Nice*, that Biſhops, Prieſts and Deacons ſhould be obliged to perpetual continence, and had ſucceeded in it, had not *Paphnutius* vehemently oppoſed the motion, and ſhewn the unreaſonableneſs and danger of ſuch an impoſition. This is related by all the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorians of that time, and is a matter well known, however impudently denied by ſome Writers of the Church of *Rome*. Even before the Council of *Nice*, *Euſtathius* Biſhop of *Sebaſtea* had endeavoured to impoſe the like neceſſity of perpetual continence upon the Clergy; which endeavour of his was condemned in the Council of *Gangra*. About fourſcore years after the Council of *Nice*, *Heliodorus* introduced a total abſtinence of the Clergy from their Wives in the Province of *Theſſaly*, where he was Biſhop. The Hiſtorian ſeems to have believed, that he firſt made the motion in the Council of *Nice*. This miſtake (as far as I can find) is purely his own. For although I have read all the Treatiſes in Defence of Prieſts Marriage, publiſhed by our Reformers; I do not remember to have obſerved this in any of them.

XIII. *Pag.* 90. *lin.* 38.

" It is true, that in (the fourth Age) they " began to make Canons against the Marriage " of those who were in Orders, especially in " the *Roman* and *African* Churches.

It was forbidden to those who were in Orders to contract Marriage, by the Apostolical Canons and Constitutions, received in the Eastern Church long before. It was forbidden also by the Council of *Neocæsarea*, and in part by the Council of *Ancyra*. But if by *Canons made against the Marriage of those in Orders*, the Historian understands the Use or Enjoyment of Marriage, whether contracted before or after Ordination; he hath then committed a great mistake in joyning the *African* to the *Roman* Churches. The Church of *Africa* did all along signally oppose and baffle the Attempts of the Popes of *Rome* for the Establishment of Celibacy therein; and retained to her Bishops the use of Marriage long after it had been generally disused by other Bishops both of the Eastern and Western Churches: insomuch as the *Quinisext* Council in the Year 692. imposing perpetual continence upon all Bishops, in pursuance of the Custom which had long since generally prevailed in the Church, took notice of the different practice of the Bishops of *Africa* herein, and by a particular Clause obliged them to conform themselves to the practice of the rest of the Catholick Church in this matter. This mistake also is peculiar to the Historian; I do not find any Footsteps of it in the Writings of our Reformers.

Can. 12.

Pag

Pag. 91. *lin.* 6. XIV.

" *Restitutus* Bishop of *London* lived openly " with his Wife.

Whether *Restitutus* were married or not, we know no more, than whether the Wise Men of the East were married. *Bale* indeed affirms it; and from him *Parker*, *Godwin*, *Spelman*, and others have taken it. But *Bale* is scarce to be believed when he relateth a matter upon his own knowledge, much less when he delivereth any thing at 1200 Years distance without any Authority. The like may be said of *Richard* Bishop of *Chicester*, who in this same Page is affirmed to have been married. The false Opinion of his Marriage seemeth to have arose, either from the hasty Inadvertency of that Reformed Writer, who first reported it; or from a double Error of the Press, substituting *Richard* Bishop of *Chicester* instead of *Robert* (*Peche*) Bishop of *Chester*.

Pag. 91. *lin.* 17. XV.

" *Lanfranc* Archbishop of *Canterbury* did " not impose Celibate on the Clergy in the " Villages, but only on those who lived in " Towns and in Prebendaries.

This mistake is wholly the Historians own. Our Reformers understood the History of the *English* Church too well, to lead the way in such an Error. *Lanfranc* imposed Celibacy on Prebendaries; but allowed to the Clergy living in Towns and Villages the use of their Marriage already contracted. His Constitution was conceived in these words. *Nullus Canonicus uxorem*

orem habeat. Sacerdotum vero in Caſtellis & in vicis habitantium habentes uxores non cogantur ut dimittant, non habentes interdicantur ut habeant. Our Reformers who wrote of the Marriage of the Clergy, repreſented this Conſtitution aright. So Archbiſhop *Parker*, who having related his prohibition of Marriage to Prebendaries, adds, *But yet he moderated ſo the matter, that he made a Decree that ſuch Prieſts as dwelt in Towns and Villages, being married, ſhould not be ſeparated, but continue with their Wives in their Miniſtration Eccleſiaſtical.*

Pag. 279.

XVI. *Pag.* 92. *lin.* 13.

"The Legate, that in King *Henry* the Second's time got that ſevere Decree made, "that put all the married Clergy from their "Livings, was found the very Night after in "Bed with a Whore.

This miſtake alſo is altogether owing to the Hiſtorian. Our Reformers, conſonantly to the Teſtimony of all our ancient Hiſtories, relate this misfortune to have happened to *Johannes de Crema*, the Pope's Legate in the Year 1125. in the Reign of King *Henry* the Firſt. And the Annals of *Winchester*, lately publiſhed, relate another like miſcarriage of the ſame Legate in the ſame Year.

Angl. Sacr. Vol. 1. *p.* 298.

XVII. *Pag.* 93. *lin.* 13.

"I have ſeen no Remains of this Convocation (which reſtored Marriage to the Clergy "in the Year 1548.) or of any the other Convocations that came afterwards in this Reign.

Arch-

Archbiſhop *Parker*, who was a Member of, and preſent at this Convocation, hath in his Additions to the Anonymous *Defence of Prieſts Marriages* publiſhed by him, given a ſhort Relation of the Tranſactions and Determination of the Convocation in this Affair; which (becauſe the Book is very ſcarce) I have tranſcribed and put into the following Collection. To it the Archbiſhop ſubjoyned the Opinion of Dr. *Redman*, which (however publiſhed by the Hiſtorian in his Collection) I would not diſjoyn; eſpecially ſince the Hiſtorian, or his Scribe, hath omitted and changed many words of moment in it. *Pag.* 351. *Numb.* 4.

Pag. 128. *lin.* 3. XVIII.

" *Bonner* was looked on generally as a Man " of no Principles. All the Obedience he gave " either to the Laws, or to the King's Injun- " ctions, was thought a Compliance againſt his " Conſcience extorted by Fear.

The Hiſtorian perhaps may be able to reconcile theſe two Periods; although it be generally ſuppoſed that where no Principles are, there can be no Conſcience; ſince Conſcience ever proceeds upon ſome Principles, either true or falſe. But it ſeems after a ſtrict Enquiry he hath diſcovered one Principle in *Bonner*, to which he conſtantly adhered: that was his Love of Pears and Puddings; a matter which will, no doubt, reflect as great Infamy upon the Memory of *Bonner*, as Honour upon the Hiſtorian for the Acuteneſs of the Obſervation. He was aware that it would be thought

disingenuous to *Print such Letters, being the Privacies of Friendship which ought not to be made publick*; but forgat that it was beneath the Majesty of History to insert such trifles in it.

XIX. *Pag.* 149. *l. ult.*

" *Ridley* was pitched on to be the man who " should fill the See of *London*. So on the 21. " of *February* (1550) he was writ for, and on " the 24th he was declared Bishop of *London* " and *Westminster*.

It might then be resolved to make *Ridley* Bishop of *Westminster* upon the intended Translation of *Thirleby*: But he could not then be declared Bishop of that See, since it was not void till *April* following, in the beginning of which Month *Thirleby* was translated to *Norwich*. King *Edward*'s Journal therefore saith, that *Ridley* was made Bishop of *London* on the 3d of *April*, and *Thirleby* translated the same day from *Westminster* to *Norwich*.

Regist. Cranmer.

XX. *Pag.* 150. *lin.* 35.

" The Lord Treasurer, *&c.* were sent to " *Gardiner* (*Fox* saith that this was on the 9th " of *July*, but there must be an Error in " that —— it must have been in *November* " the former Year.) They brought him a Pa- " per, to which they desired he would set his " hand.

In the Original Council-Book of King *Edward* the Sixth, before-mentioned, all the Orders, Messages, Papers, Articles and Answers relating

relating to *Gardiner*, are at length inserted. From thence I shall correct the Historians Account. On the 8th of *June* 1550. it was resolved in Council, *Considering the long Imprisonment the Bishop of* Winchester *hath sustained, that he should be spoken withal; and agreed, that if he repented his former Obstinacy, and would thenceforth apply himself to advance the King's Majesties proceedings, his Highness in this case would be his good Lord, and remit all his Errors passed. Otherwise his Majesty was resolved to proceed against him as his Obstinacy and Contempt required. For the Declaration whereof, the Duke of* Somerset, *Lord Treasurer, &c. were appointed the next day to repair unto him.* June 10th. *Report was made by the Duke of* Somerset, *and the rest sent to the Bishop of* Winchester, *that he desired to see the King's Book of Proceedings, upon the sight whereof he would make a full Answer; seeming to be willing in all things to conform himself thereunto, and promising that in case any thing offended his Conscience, he would open it to none but the Counsail. Whereupon it was agreed, that the Book should be sent him, to see his Answer, that his Case may be resolved on. And that for the mean time, he should have the Liberty of the Gallery and Garden in the* Tower, *when the Duke of* Norfolk *were absent.* June 13th. *the Lieutenant of the* Tower, *who before was appointed to deliver the King's Book to him, declared to the Counsail, that the Bishop having refused it, said unto him, He could make no direct Answer, unless he were at Liberty; and so being, he would say his Conscience. Whereupon the Lords, and others, that had been with him the other day, were appointed*

pointed to go to him again, to receive a direct Answer; that the Counsail hereupon might determine further Order for him. July 8*th the Bishop of* Winchester's *Case was renewed.* Then was the Lord Treasurer, *&c.* sent to him with the Message, of which the Historian here speaketh. Together with the Articles, the Council sent a Letter to him, blaming his Obstinacy, and persuading him to conform. *Fox* giveth a true Account of the Articles, and his Answer to them. Only hath erroneously put the 9th for the 8th of *July*. Although he might mean, that the Commissioners went to him on that day: which seems to have been true. For on the 10th of *July* the Commissioners reported his Answer in Council, related by *Fox*, and from him by the Historian. And that these Commissioners went indeed to the Bishop on the 9th of *July*, King *Edward* testifyeth in his Journal, published by the Historian himself.

XXI.

Pag. 151. *lin.* 7.

" *Herbert* and *Petre* came to him some time " after that, but how soon it is not clear, and " pressed him to make the Acknowledgment " without Exception.

The Council-Book fixeth the time of this Message, and cleareth a mistake of the Historian. July 11th. *This day the Bishop of* Winchester's *Case was debated; and because it appears that he sticketh upon the Submission, which is the principalest Point, considering his offence that the now goeth about to defend, to the intent that he should have no just cause to say that he was not mercifully*

mercifully handled; it was agreed, that the Master of the Horse, and Mr. Secretary Petre *should repair unto him again with the same Submission: exhorting him to look better upon it; and in case the words seem too sore, then to refer unto himself, in what sort, and in what words he should devise to submit him; that upon the acknowledging of his fault, the King's Highness might extend his mercy and liberality towards him, as it was determined.* On the 13th of *July*, his Answer was reported in Council, which was, *That he stood precisely in Justification of himself, that he had never offended the King's Majesty: wherefore he utterly refused to make any Submission at all. For the more surety of which Denial, it was agreed, that a new Book of Articles should be devised; wherewith the said Master of the Horse, and Mr. Secretary, should repair to him again; and for the more Authentick proceeding with him, they to have with them a Divine and Temporal Lawyer, which were the Bishop of* London *and Mr.* Gooderick. The Historian nameth only *Ridley*. Then followeth *a Copy of the Articles sent to the Bishop of* Winchester; the Summ of which is truly related by *Fox* and the Historian. *July* 15th, the Bishops Answer was reported in Council; whereupon it was agreed he should be sent for by the Council, and be examined before them; which being done *July* 19th, and the Articles read to him, and his Subscription peremptorily required, he made this short Answer: *That in all things that his Majesty would lawfully command him, he was willing and most ready to obey. But forasmuch as there were divers things required of him, which his Conscience would*

not

not bear, therefore he prayed them to have him excused. Whereupon the Sentence of Sequestration was read, and Denunciation of Deprivation, in case he did not conform within three Months. *Nevertheless upon divers good Considerations, and especially in hope he might within this time be yet reconciled, it was agreed, that the said Bishops House and Servants should be maintained in their present Estate, until the time of this intimation should expire; and the matter for the mean time to be kept private.* There is some little difference between the Council-Book and King *Edward's* Journal, in fixing the days of these two Messages.

Pag. 152. *lin.* 32.

XXII. "On the third of *July* this Year (1550.) "*Hooper* was by Letters Patents appointed to "be Bishop of *Gloucester*.

The Council-Book saith, on the 15th of *May*, Mr. *Hooper was constituted Bishop of* Gloucester: King *Edward's* Journal saith, July 20th, Hooper *was made Bishop of* Gloucester: The first may relate to his Nomination, the second to the Signing of his Patent.

XXIII. *Pag* 153. *lin.* 19.

"*Cranmer* wrote about this difference, (rai-"sed by *Hooper* about wearing the Episcopal "Vestments) to *Bucer*, reducing it to these "two plain Questions, *Whether it was lawful* "*to use those Garments*, &c.——*And whether* "*he that affirmed that it was unlawful, or so that* "*Account refused to use those Vestments, did not sin* "*against God*,

The

The latter part of the Question put by *Cranmer* was this, *An is qui affirmaverit nefas esse, aut recusarit, his vestibus uti, peccet in Deum, quia immundum esse dicit quod Deus sanctificavit, & in Magistratu, quod violet ordinem Politicum.* The Historian therefore hath negligently translated it, and in part changed the State of the Question, by adding these words *on that Account*, which make the refusal to proceed wholly upon a Supposition that the Thing commanded was unlawful by the Law of God, whereas *Cranmer* put the Question more generally in those words *aut recusarit*, so as to include a refusal to obey the Command of the Magistrate out of wilfulness, or for any other cause, beside pretence of unlawfulness by the Law of God, which is taken away by the answering to the first part of the Question.

Pag. 154. *lin.* 29. XXIV

"*Cranmer* wrote back, that he could not "dispense with the use of Episcopal Garments "at the Consecration of *Hooper*, without incurring a *Præmunire*. So the King was moved "to write to him, warranting him to do it. "But though this was done on the 4th of *Aug.* "yet he was not consecrated till *March* next "year, and in the mean while he was suspended from Preaching.

The King and Council rejected the Puritanical niceness of *Hooper's* Conscience, much further than all this amounts to: which Affairs I will relate from the Council-Book. *In Council* 1550. October 6th. *A Letter to the Bishop of* London, *that where there hath been some difference*

ference between him and the Elect Bishop of Gloucester, *upon certain Ceremonies belonging to the making of a Bishop, wherein their Lordships desire it, because they would in no wise the stirring up of Controversies between men of one Profession, did send for him, willing him to cease the occasions thereof; who humbly desired that he might for Declaration of his doings put in writing such Arguments as moved him to be of the* Opinion *he held; which thing was granted, and was by their Lordships commanded to be at the Court on Sunday next, bringing with him, that he shall for an Answer have thought convenient* 1551. January 13th. *Mr.* Hooper *Bishop Elect of* Gloucester, *appeared before the Council touching his old Matter, of denying to wear such Apparel as other Bishops wear; and having been before commanded to keep his House, unless it were to go to the Archbishop of* Canterbury, *Bishops of* Ely, London, *or* Lincoln, *for satisfaction or Counsail of his Conscience in that matter; nor further, neither to Preach, nor Read, until he had further License from the Council: it appeared both that he had not kept his House, and that he had also written and Printed a Book, wherein was contained matter that he should not have written. For the which, and for that also he persevered in his former Opinion of not wearing the Bishops Apparel, he was now committed to the Archbishop of* Canterbury's *Custody, either there to be reformed, or further to be punished as the Obstinacy of his case required.* January 27th. *Upon a Letter from the Archbishop of* Canterbury, *that Mr.* Hooper *cannot be brought to any Conformity, but rather persevering in his Obstinacy, coveteth to prescribe Orders and necessary Laws of his head,*

it

it was agreed, he should be committed to the Fleet upon the occasion aforesaid. A Letter to the Warden of the Fleet, to receive the said Mr. Hooper, *and to keep him from Conference of any Person, saving the Ministery of that House.* On the 8th of *March* following he was consecrated. Now all this was done after the King's Letter wrote in his behalf to *Cranmer*; so that in all appearance he was forced to reconcile his squeamish Conscience to the Episcopal Habit, in order to obtain his Bishoprick.

Pag. 154. *lin.* 36. *&* 48. XXV.

" This Summer *John a Lasco*, with a Con-
" gregation of *Germans*, was allowed to hold
" his Assembly at St. *Austin's* in *London*——*Po-*
" *lidor Virgil* desired leave to go out of *Eng-*
" *land*, which was granted to him on the 2d
" of *June* this Year 1550.

To this I will add, that on the 19th of *November* 1551. the Council ordered a Reward of an 100 Pounds to be given to *John Alasco*. And that *Polidor Virgil* went not out of *England* before the end of the Year 1551. For I find an Order of Council 1551. *Octob.* 14. to deliver to *Polidor Virgil*, in way of the King's reward, the Summ of One hundred Marks, and another Order 1551. *Nov.* 9. *to pay to to* Plidor Virgil *in way of the King's Majesties reward the Summ of* 300 *Crowns, after Five shillings the Crown.*

Pag.

XXVI. *Pag.* 155. *lin.* 2.

"On the 26th of *June* 1550. *Poynet* was de-
"clared Bishop of *Rochester*.

The Council-Book saith, that 1550. *May* 11th, Mr. *Poynet was appointed Bishop of* Rochester. King *Edward's* Journal, *June* 30th. John Poynet *made Bishop of* Rochester, *and received his Oath.* This latter is to be understood of the reception of his Temporalties from, and doing Homage to, the King. For he was consecrated *June* 29th.

XXVII. *Pag.* 156. *lin.* 19.

"*Bucer* wrote a Book, Entituled, *Concern-*
"*ing the Kingdom of Christ*. In it he com-
"plains much of Pluralities and Non-Residence,
"as a Remainder of Popery, so hurtful to the
"Church, that in many places there were but
"one or two, or few more, Sermons in a whole
"Year.

The Historians affection to the present Con-
Pag. 12. stitution of our Church in relation to Plurality of Benefices is well known. He had before said in his Preface, that the present use of Pluralities of England *was a Relique of Popery, a scandal of a crying Nature, which may justly make us blush.* But he will never be able to adapt *Bucer's* words to such Pluralities, as are now allowed and practised in this Church.

De Regno Christi, l. 1. *c.* 19. The words of *Bucer* are these, *Quos reperias, qui licet manifesto & horrendo Sacrilegio plurium Parochiarum emolumenta absumant tamen ne uni quidem debitum impendere ministerium, vel per suos*

suos mercenarios, taceo per seipsos, dignetur? Si enim bi in locis Splendidis & frequentioribus unam & alteram vel paulo plures in anno conciones habuerint, existimant se suo munere præclare esse defunctos; reliquum omne tempus otio, luxui, pompæ mundanæ impendunt. Wherein he blathed those who received the Profits of many Benefices with Cure of Souls, and yet served not the Cure of any one of them, either by Curates or their own Persons, whereas it is notorious, that at this time none is permitted to hold above two Benefices, and both are constantly supplied by the Beneficiary either personally, or by Curates; and Sermons preached in either every Sunday: whereas also those, whom *Bucer* complaineth of, thought they satisfied their Duty if they preached two, three or more Sermons in a year, in some populous and eminent places, which the Historian by mistake interprets of their own Parishes. I find but one remarkable thing concerning Pluralities during the whole Reign of *Edward* VI. and that is an Order of Council 1550. *June* 28. *That upon Consideration Mr.* Poynet *now Elect Bishop of* Rochester *hath no House to dwell on, and his Living small, it was agreed he should enjoy his Benefice in* Commendam. *But from henceforth it is decreed, that no Bishop shall keep other Benefice than his Bishoprick only.*

Pag. 160. *lin.* 18. XXVIII

"The Duke of *Lunenburg* had offered the "King 10000 men to his Assistance, and desired to enter into a Treaty of Marriage for "the Lady *Mary*.

The Council-Book saith it was the D. of *Brandenburgh* who proposed to treat of a Marriage with the Lady *Mary*, and that the Embassador, who came to propose it, had Two hundred pounds given to him by way of Gratuity. King *Edward's* Journal indeed relateth it of the Duke of *Brunswick*.

XXIX. *Pag.* 165. *lin.* 3.

"*Gardiner* was soon after (*February* 1551.) "put out. There was a Commission issued out "to the Archbishop, *&c.*——He put in a "Compurgation.——Upon this many Witnes- "ses were Examined.——His Judges on the "18th of *April*, gave Sentence against him, by "which they deprived him of his Bishoprick.

I find in the Council-Book, that the Bishop of *Winchester's* Case was first renewed after the Sequestration, 1550. *Nov.* 23. when it was agreed in Council, that the Bishop of *Ely*, Secretary *Petre*, Dr. *May*, and Dr. *Glynn*, should confer on the matter, and on *Tuesday* following should certifie to the Council, what was to be done by the Order of Law in that case. What was their report doth not appear. But *Decemb.* 14. the Council ordered, that the Lieutenant of the *Tower* should carry him to *Lambeth*, before the Archbishop and other Commissioners constituted in his Cause on *Monday* following, and after that, when and as often as he shall be by them required. *Decemb.* 16. The Commissioners having allowed Council to *Gardiner*, this was approved by the King's Council, and the Persons by him named were Licensed to repair

to

to the *Tower* to him, and that although one of them was the King's Chaplain. *January* 19th. Two of his Servants came to the Privy-Council, and desired that certain of them might be sworn upon certain Articles, as Witnesses in behalf of the Bishop. The Privy Councellors offered to Answer to those Articles upon their Honour, but would not be sworn. *February* 15th. It was ordered in Council, *That forasmuch as the Bishop had at all times before the Judges of his cause, used himself unreverently to the King's Majesty, and very slanderously towards his Council, and especially yesterday being the day of his Judgment given against him* (so that he was deprived on the 14th of *February*) *be called the Judges Hereticks and Sacramentaries, these being there the Kings Commissioners, and of his Highnesses Counsail, he should be removed from his present into a meaner Lodging in the* Tower, *and have but one Servant to wait on him; that his Books and Papers be taken from him, and that from henceforth he have neither Pen, Ink nor Paper, but be sequestred from all Conference, and from all means that may serve him to practise any ways.* King *Edward's* Journal saith, that the Bishop after long Tryal was Deposed, *February* 13th.

Pag. 165. *lin.* 47. XXX.

"Eight days after, (on the 26th of *April*) "*Poynet* was translated from *Rochester* to *Win*-"*chester*.

That the See of *Winchester* was void by the Deprivation of *Gardiner*, before the 18th of

Pag. 24. *April*, the Hiſtorian might have learned from King *Edward's* Journal publiſhed by himſelf; wherein it is ſaid, *that* April *the* 5*th*, Poynet *Biſhop of* Rocheſter *received his Oath for the Biſhoprick of* Wincheſter, viz. *then he received the Temporalities of* Wincheſter. The Council-Book ſaith that *February* 8th. *This day by the King's own Appointment Dr.* Poynet *Biſhop of* Rocheſter, *was appointed and admitted Biſhop of* Wincheſter. And *April* the 9th, *A Letter was writ to the Treaſurer of the Firſt fruits in favour of Mr.* Skorie *appointed Biſhop of* Rocheſter.

XXXI. *Pag.* 166. *lin.* 1.

"*Veyſey* Biſhop of *Exeter* did alſo reſign, pre-
" tending extream old Age; but he had reſerved
" a Penſion yearly for himſelf during Life, out
" of the Lands of the Biſhoprick, and almoſt
" all the reſt he had baſely alienated, taking
" care only for himſelf, and ruining his Suc-
" ceſſors.

The Memory of *Veyſey* ſuffers upon this Account on all hands. The caſe of his Biſhoprick indeed was very deplorable, which from one of the richeſt in his time, became the pooreſt of all the old *Engliſh* Biſhopricks. But had any Biſhop of *England* ſate at *Exeter* at that time, he muſt have done the ſame thing, or have been immediately deprived. For *Veyſey* alienated no Poſſeſſions of his See, but upon expreſs Command of the King, directed to him under the Privy Seal in favour of certain Noblemen and Courtiers. All the Biſhops at that time were ſubjected to a like Calamity. Even

Cranmer

Cranmer was forced to part with the better half of the Poſſeſſions of his See, and *Ridley* ſoon after his Entry into *London*, was forced to give away the four beſt Mannors of his See for ever in one day. Theſe two were the greateſt Favourites among all the Biſhops in that Reign. Others were yet more ſeverely dealt with. The common Pretence was to exchange ſome Lands of their Biſhopricks with others of Religious Houſes remaining in the King's hands ſince their Suppreſſion. Even then it was ſuch an exchange, as *Diomedes* made with *Ajax*. But to *Veyſey* no other recompence was made, than the Promiſe of the Kings Good-will and Favour, aſſured to him in the concluſion of all thoſe Mandates, in caſe of Compliance with them; the effect of which Promiſes was, that after he had complied with them to the ruin of his See, he was forced to reſign it, *per metum & terrorem*, as himſelf afterward alledged. All he could do was to Enregiſter at length all thoſe Privy-Seals for the Vindication of himſelf to his Succeſſors for ever; which he hath carefully done.

Pag. 166. *lin.* 4. XXXII.

" *Miles Coverdale* was made Biſhop of *Exeter*
" ——the buſineſs of *Hooper* was now alſo ſet-
" led; ſo he was conſecrated in *March* 1551.

The Hiſtorian hath inverted the true Order of their being made Biſhops. For *Hooper* was conſecrated 1551. *March* 8th, and *Coverdale* on the 30th of *Auguſt* following, being nomi- *Regiſt.* nated on the 27th of *Auguſt*, according to King *Cranmer.* *Edward's* Journal.

XXXIII. *Pag.* 171. *lin.* 34.

"This Year 1551. there were Six eminent "Preachers choſen out to be the Kings Chap- "lains in Ordinary, two of theſe were always "to attend the Court, and four to be ſent o- "ver *England* to Preach in their Courſes, "——Theſe were *Bill*, *Harley*, *Pern*, *Grindal*, "*Bradford*, the Name of the Sixth is ſo daſhed "in the King's Journal, that it cannot be "read.

It might be gueſſed from ſome Paſſages in the Council-Book, that the Sixth Preacher was *Knox*. For 1552. *October* 21. A Letter was ſent from the Privy-Council to Mr. *Harley*, *Bill*, *Horn*, *Grindal*, *Pern*, and *Knox*, to conſider, *certain Articles exhibited to the Kings Majeſty, to be ſubſcribed by all ſuch as ſhould be admitted to be Preachers or Miniſters, in any part of the Realm, and to make report of their Opinions of the ſame. Shortly after to Mr.* Knox *Preacher in the North*, Forty pounds were given by way of Gratuity. And 1552. *December* 9th. *A Letter to the Lord* Wharton *in recommendation of Mr.* Knox. And 1553. *February* 2. *A Letter to the Archbiſhop of* Canterbury *in favour of Mr.* Knox, *to be preſented by him to the Church of* All-hallows *in* Breadſtreet London. Laſtly 1553. *June* 2. *A Letter to the Lord* Ruſſel, *and the Juſtices of the Peace in* Buckinghamſhire, *in favour of Mr.* Knox *the Preacher*. The Author alſo of the *Hiſtory of the Church of* Scotland aſcribed to him, relateth, that he was firſt appointed Preacher to *Barwick*, then to *Newcaſtle*, and was at length called to *London*, and to the South

South part of *England*. To the Life of *Bernard Gilpin*, wrote by Bishop *Carleton*, is added a Letter from him to his Brother, wherein he saith of himself, that Secretary *Cecil* obtained for him from King *Edward* a License constituting him a general Preacher throughout the Kingdom, so long as the King lived. But after all, I rather think, that the Name of the Sixth Preacher was *Thexton*. For I did near Twenty years since see, in the hands of a worthy Clergyman descended from him, an Original Commission under the King's Seal, given to him, whereby he was Authorized by him to Preach in the North-East parts of *England*. I do not at so great distance of time fully remember the Contents of the Commission, but I think it to have been such, as agreeth well with the Time and Office of these six Preachers.

Pag. 171. *&c.* XXXIV.

"The Business of the Lady *Mary*, was "now taken up with more heat than formerly. "——The Council finding that her Chap- "lains had said Mass in one of her Houses, they "ordered them to be proceeded against. Upon "which in *December* the last Year (*viz.* 1550.) "she writ earnestly to the Council to let it "fall.——The Council writ her a long "Answer.——So the Matter slept till the "beginning of *May* 1551.——In *July* the "Council sent for Three of her chief Officers, "and gave them Instructions to signifie the "Kings Pleasure to her, and to return with an "Answer.——In *August* they came back "and said, that she charged them not to deli-

" ver their Meſſage to the reſt of the Family,
" in which they being her Servants could not
" diſobey her —— Upon this they were ſent to
" the Tower. The Lord Chancellour, &c.
" were next ſent to her with a Letter from
" the King, &c

There being ſome miſtakes in this Relation, I will amend them, and add ſome farther light to the account, out of the Council-Book. The Emperour's Embaſſadours preſſed the Council 1551. *Febr.* 16. to obſerve their promiſe made to him for permiſſion to the Lady *Mary* of the exerciſe of her Religion, till the
Pag. 23. King ſhould come to age, *March* 18. The King relateth in his Journal, that he ſent for her to *Weſtminſter*, and told her he could not any longer bear her practiſe. Upon this next day the Emperour's Embaſſadour declared War to the King, if he continued not to her the liberty of her Religion. Thereupon *Mar.* 22. *Cranmer*, *Ridley*, and *Poynet* diſcourſed with the King about the lawfulneſs of the permiſſion. And *March* 23. the Council decreed to ſend *Wotton* to the Emperour (who was not diſpatched till the 10th. of *April*) and in the mean time to puniſh the offenders, firſt of the King's Servants that heard Maſs, next of hers, *March* 24. Sir *Anth. Brown*, and Sergeant *Morgan* were ſent to the *Fleet* for hearing Maſs. Thus King *Edward*'s Journal, which I have obſerved to be often falſe in the days, and eſpecially in this place. For in the Council-Book it is ſaid *March* 18th. the *Emperour's Embaſſadour had acceſs to the Council*. What was ſaid by him, or anſwered to him doth not ap-

appear; it being probable that for more ſecrecy the Clerk was then excluded, *March* 19. Serjeant *Morgan* was committed to the *Fleet*, and *March* 22. Sir *Anth. Brown* for hearing Maſs in her company, when by the King's order he attended her from *Eſſex* to *London*. Now all this, relating to the Emperour's denunciation of War, to the King's Conſultation with the Biſhops, to the Councils debate thereon, and the ſending of Dr. *Wotton*, is erroneouſly placed by the Hiſtorian before *December* 1550. It is alſo a miſtake that the proſecution of the Chaplains kept from *December* 1550, to *May* 1551. For it was not begun till *December* 15, and *March* 23. (according to the King's Journal, I think rather the 18*th*.) it was reſolved to puniſh her Servants hearing or ſaying Maſs: Accordingly in the Council-Book, I find that *March* 22. her Comptroller Mr. *Rocheſter* was examined how many Chaplains ſhe had, who anſwered, four, viz. *Mallet*, *Hopton*, *Barker* and *Ricardes*, *April* 29. (the King's Journal ſaith falſly the 27*th*.) Dr. *Mallet* was brought before the Council, and *being examined, what he meaned, that after he had been once forgiven, he would again wilfully offend the King's laws in ſaying of Maſs, and other like, could not deny but he had done evil in ſo doing——He therefore was committed to the Tower.* So that *Mallet* was now impriſoned for a ſecond offence, not (as the Hiſtorian ſaith) becauſe he could not be before this apprehended ſince his firſt proſecution. *May*, and *Brown*, and *Morgan*, upon their ſubmiſſion were diſcharged from their impri-

ſonment,

fonment. Nothing further was done in this matter till *Aug.* 9. when it was reſolved in Council to ſend for the chief Officers of the Lady *Mary*'s Houſe, and to give them in charge not to permit Maſs to be ſaid in her Houſe, or to hear it, and to give the ſame charge to her Chaplains and other Servants. The ſame day it was reſolved not to permit the uſe of Maſs to the Emperour's Ambaſſadour, ſince he would not permit the *Engliſh* Ambaſſadour reſident in his Dominions the uſe of our Liturgy. So that now the Council began *to be leſs in fear of the Emperour*, not before the End of the laſt Year, as the Hiſtorian hath it. *Aug.* 11. a Warrant was ſigned for the appearance of the Lady *Mary*'s Officers. *Aug.* 14. there appeared *Robert Rocheſter*, *Edward Malgrave*, and Sir *Francis Engleſield*, her three chief Officers, and were ſtrictly charged, not to ſignifie the King's pleaſure to her to have the new Service in her Family, and to give the like charge to her Chaplains and all her Servants, (as the Hiſtorian relateth) but only to charge the Chaplains not to ſay Maſs in her Houſe, or elſewhere, and the Servants not to hear it, and themſelves to conform to the ſame Order, and to take care that the others did it. *Aug.* 22. (the King's Journal ſaith the 23d.) the Officers returning reported to the Council, that having firſt related their Inſtructions to her Grace (which they had not been commanded to do) ſhe had abſolutely forbidden them to deliver their charge to the Chaplains and Servants. They alſo brought with them a Letter wrote by her to the King, which I have

have inſerted in the following Collection. Upon which the Officers were (not immediately ſent to the Tower, as the Hiſtorian writeth, but) called before the Council next day, and reproved for not having executed their former Inſtructions, but *troubling her Grace with the opening their Meſſage to her contrary to the Order and Charge preſcribed to them; wherefore each of them by himſelf, and a-part was commanded to return to her Graces Houſe, and execute the ſaid Charge apart, in ſuch ſort as the Order was given to them on the* 14th. *Aug. The which thing they all refuſed to do; albeit they were enjoined to do the ſame in virtue of their Allegiance.* Thereupon they were commanded to attend continually, till they ſhould know the Councils farther pleaſure. It was alſo decreed that the Lord Chancellour, Secretary *Petre*, and Sir *Anth. Wingfield* ſhould repair to the Lady *Mary* with a Letter from the King, and large Inſtructions from the Council, which were ſent to them being then in *Eſſex*. The Letter I have put into the Collection. The Inſtructions contained a Command, to declare to her the King's peremptory reſolution, not to permit to her any longer the uſe of the Maſs, the reaſons which induced the Council to ſend a Charge to her Chaplains and Houſhold by her own Servants (which ſhe had extremely reſented) the negligence of her Officers in not executing that Charge, to juſtifie the King's proceedings to her, and laſtly calling her Chaplains and Servants before them, to charge them ſtrictly not to ſay or hear Maſs. *Aug.* 29. the Com-

Numb. 5.

Numb. 6.

Commiſſioners being returned, made report in Council of the Execution of their Charge, and of the Lady *Mary*'s Anſwer, whom they had attended on the 28th. The Report is large, the ſubſtance of which is rightly given by the Hiſtorian. When their Report was ended, an Order was made that *Rocheſter*, *Inglefield* and *Walgrave* ſhould be conveyed from the *Fleet*, (to which they had been committed the day before) to the Tower: Next year on the 14*th*. of *April* they were ſet at liberty, and commanded to return to their Lady, and attend her Service as ſhe had requeſted.

XXXV. *Pag.* 177. *lin.* 32.

" The *Engliſh* Embaſſadours in *France* 1551. " moved for the Daughter of *France* (to be " given in marriage to King *Edward*) yet this " never taking effect, it is needleſs to enlarge " farther about it, of which the Reader will " find all the particulars in King *Edward*'s " Journal.

This Treaty of Marriage had a conſiderable Effect, not mentioned in the King's Journal. For it is ſaid in the Council-Book, that 30. *Dec.* 1551. *This day the Lord Admiral being returned out of* France, *delivered to the Lords the Ratification of the Marriage, between the King's Majeſty and the Lady* Elizabeth, *the* French *Kings Daughter, under the Great Seal of* France. *And it was accorded that the ſame Treaty ſhould be delivered to the Lord Treaſurer, to be by him repoſed in the Treaſury of the Exchequer,*

chequr, to remain there of record in ſafe keeping.

Pag. 194. *lin.* 43. XXXVI.

" *Tonſtall* Biſhop of *Dureſm* was, upon ſome
" complaint brought againſt him of Miſpriſion
" of Treaſon, put into the Tower about the
" end of *December* laſt year, *viz.* 1551. What
" the particulars were I do not find.

King *Edward*'s Journal placeth his Impriſonment on the 20th. of *December* 1551. and ſo doth the Council-Book, which relateth the Cauſe of it in theſe Words. *Whereas the Biſhop of* Dureſm, *about* July *in Anno* 1550, *was charged by* Ninian Menvile *to have conſented to a Conſpiracy in the North, for the raiſing of a Rebellion; as by the ſame accuſation in writing, the Biſhop's Anſwer thereunto, and* Menvile's *Replication to the ſame, may at length appear. For as much as for want of a Letter written by the ſaid Biſhop to* Menvile, *whereupon depended a great Trial of this matter, the Determination thereof was hitherto ſtayed, and the Biſhop only commanded to keep his Houſe, untill he ſhould be called to further Anſwer; which Letter being lately come to light, found in a Cask of the Duke of* Somerſets *after his laſt apprehenſion; the Biſhop was now ſent for, and this day made his appearance before the Lords, by whom being charged with this matter, and his own Letter produced againſt him, which he could not deny but to be of his own hand, and unable to make any further Anſwer thereto than he had done before by Writing, he was, for that the ſame ſeemed not a*

ſufficient

ſufficient Anſwer, committed by the King's Commandment to the Tower *of* London, *to abyde there*, &c. He had been accuſed by *Menvile* before 1550. For the Hiſtory of the Biſhops of *Durham*, lately publiſhed, affirmeth, that Dr. *Whitehead* Dean of *Durham*, being together with the Biſhop and his Chancellor *Hindmarſh* accuſed by *Menvile*, was forced to goe to *London* where he died in 1548. Whoſoever ſucceeded him in the Deanry, ſeemeth for ſome time to have been an Adverſary of the Biſhop. For in the Council-Book it is ſaid 1551. *May* 20. *The Biſhop of* Dureſm *upon hearing the matter between him and the Dean of* Dureſm, *was committed to his Houſe*. On the 8th. *July* following, the Council *ordered the Dean of* Dureſm *to Anſwer in Writing unto Matters as he was charged with at his being before the Council, and in ſuch ſort as he will ſtand to at his peril*, Aug. 2. The Biſhop had Licenſe granted to him to walk in the Fields. *October* 5. A Letter was wrote by the Council *to the Lord Treaſurer, Lord Chamberlain, Secretary* Cecil, *and Mr.* Maſon, *to hear and examine the Biſhop and Dean of* Dureſme's *Caſe, and to make them report of the ſame; and if they ſhall ſo think convenient, to ſend for them and their Accuſer, together or apart, as ſhall ſeem beſt unto them.* So that by this time the Biſhop and Dean were involved in the ſame Cauſe. *November* 3. The Dean of *Durham* was bound by the Council in a Recognizance of Two hundred Pounds to appear before the Council on the firſt day of the next Term. He was then very ſick and ſeemeth to have died within few days after. For the King granted

Anglor. Par. 1. *p.* 782.

Athen. Oxon. *Par.* 1.

the

the Deanry to Dr. *Horn* 1551. *November* 20. The name of the Dean intervening between *Whitehead* and *Horn*, I cannot recover, and am ready to suspect, that the time of *Whitehead's* Death is falsly related in the History of *Durham*; and that the Order of Council of the 20th of *May* was not well worded by the Clerk. For *Horn* is by many affirmed, to have succeeded immediately to *Whitehead*, and to him the Council 1552. *February* 18th. granted a Letter directed to the Prebendaries of *Durham, to conform themselves to such Orders in Religion and Divine Service, standing with the Kings proceeding, as their Dean Mr.* Horn *shall set forth; whom the Lords require to receive and use well, as being sent to them for the weal of the Country by his Majesty.* To return to *Tonstall*; while he lay in the *Tower* in the Year 1551. he wrote his Book *De veritate corporis & sanguinis Domini in Eucharistia*, in the 77th. Year of his Age, which was Printed at *Paris*, 1554.

XXXVII

Pag. 196. *lin.* 28.

"On the First of *November* last Year (*viz.* "1551.) a Commission was granted to Eight "Persons to prepare the Matter (a Reforma-"tion of the Ecclesiastical Laws) for the Re-"view of the Two and thirty.

On the 6th of *October* 1551 the Council had directed a Letter to the Lord Chancellor, *To make out Commission to Thirty two Persons* (*viz.* Eight Bishops, *Canterbury*, *London*, *Winchester*, *Ely*, *Exeter*, *Gloucester*, *Bath*, *Rochester*: Eight Divines, *Taylor* of *Lincoln*, *Cox*, *Parker*, *Latimer*, *Cook*,

Cook, *Martyr*, *Cheek*, *Masco*: Eight Civiliani, *Petre*, *Cecill*, Sir *Tho. Smyth*, *Taylor* of *Hadley*, *May*, *Traheron*, *Lyell*, *Skinner*: Eight common Lawyers, Juſtice *Hales*, Juſtice *Bromley*, *Goodrick*, *Goſnald*, *Stamford*, *Carrell*, *Lucas*, *Brook*,) *To authorize them to Aſſemble together; and to reſolve upon the Reformation of the Canon Law: Eight of theſe to rough hew the Canon Law, the reſt to conclude it afterwards.* On the 9th of *November* 1551. a new Commiſſion was ordered to thoſe Eight Perſons mentioned by the Hiſtorian, *For the firſt drawing and ordering the Canon Law, for that ſome of thoſe before appointed are now thought meet by the King to be left out.* The Commiſſion was Sealed *November* 11. as appears by the *Reformatio legum Eccl.* Printed at *London* 1571, 1640. Next Year, *viz.* 1552. *February* 2. it was ordered that the Lord Chancellor *make out a Commiſſion to the Archbiſhop of* Canterbury, *and other Biſhops, Learned men, Civilians and Lawyers of the Realm, for the Eſtabliſhment of the Eccleſiaſtical Laws, according to the Act of Parliament made the laſt Seſſions.* The granting of this Commiſſion King *Edward* placeth in the 10th of *February*, and giveth a Liſt of the Commiſſioners Names: but among the Civilians hath omitted *Huſſey*, principal Regiſtrary of the See of *Canterbury*, whoſe Name I find added to this Liſt, in ſome Papers of Archbiſhop *Parker*, wherein alſo inſtead of Mr. *Red* .... the Name of *Holford* occurs.

Pag.

Pag. 203. *lin.* 3. xxxviii

"This Year 1552. *Day* of *Chicheſter*, was put "out of his Biſhoprick.——— Whether he re- "fuſed to ſubmit to the new Book, or fell into "other Tranſgreſſions I do not know.———, "His Sentence is ſomething ambiguouſly ex- "preſſed in the Patent that *Story* had to ſuc- "ceed him, which bears Date the 24th of "*May*.

The Council-Book giveth a large account of this matter 1550. *October* 7. The Council ordered Dr. *Cox* to repair into *Suſſex*, *to appeaſe the people by his good Doctrine, which are now troubled through the ſeditious preaching of the Biſhop of* Chicheſter *and others*, *November* 8. The Biſhop of *Chicheſter* appeared before the Council, *to Anſwer the things objected to him for Preaching. And becauſe he denied the words of his Accuſation, he was commanded within two days to bring in writing what he preached. November* 30. The Duke of *Somerſet* declared in Council, that the Biſhop of *Chicheſter*, coming to him two days before, had ſhewed him, that whereas he had received Letters from the King and Council (a Copy of which may be found in the Council-Book) commanding him to take down all Altars in the Churches of his Dioceſs, and in lieu of them to ſet up Tables in ſome convenient place of the Chauncels, and to cauſe the Reaſonableneſs of it to be declared to the people in Preaching, *He could not conform his Conſcience to do what he was by the ſaid Letter commanded, and therefore prayed to be excuſed*. Upon this the Biſhop was commanded

to appear the day following, which he did, and being asked, what he said to the King's Letter, he answered, that *he could not conform his Conscience to take down the Altars in the Church, and in lieu of them to set up Tables, as the Letter appointed, for that he seemed for his Opinion, the Scripture, and the Consent of the Doctors and Fathers of the Church, and contrariwise did not perceive any strength in the Six Reasons, which were set forth by the Bishop of* London, *to persuade the taking down of Altars and Erection of Tables. And then being demanded, what Scriptures he had, he alledged a saying in* Esay, *which place being considered by the Archbishop of* Canterbury, *the Bishop of* London's, *and the Lords in the Council, was found of no purpose to maintain his Opinion.* Then the Archbishop and Bishop of *Ely* argued the Lawfulness and Reasonableness of the thing, after which he was commanded by the Council to conform, which he still refusing, because contrary to his Conscience, he was ordered to resort to the Archbishop of *Canterbury*, the Bishops of *Ely* and *London*, to confer with them for satisfying his Conscience and to appear again the 4th of *December*. When he then appeared, being demanded, he stuck to his former Resolution, and entred into a Dispute with the Archbishop about the merits of the Cause, and alledged the former place out of *Esaiah*, and a place out of the last Chapter of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*. Which the Archbishop and Bishop of *Ely* answered, and shew from *Origen*, that in the Primitive Church *Christians* had no Altars, and urged the necessity of reforming the abuses of Altars:

But

But *touching the naming the Table an Altar, it was left indifferent to him, so to name it because ancient Writers sometime call that Table an Altar.* Notwithstanding the Bishop persevering in his Resolution, although he was now again commanded on his Allegiance to comply, the Council ordered him to appear again on *Sunday*, and then to give his final Answer. Which he did, and answered that *plainly he could not do it saving his Conscience, and that he determined rather to lose all that ever he had.* Hereupon two days more were given to him to deliberate. But on the 11th of *December*, persisting and praying them *to do with him what they thought convenient, for he would never obey to do this thing, thinking it a less evil to suffer the Body to perish, than to corrupt the Soul, he was* committed to the *Fleet*. On the 9th of *June* 1551. an Order was sent to the Warden of the *Fleet*, to suffer the Bishop of *Chichester to have such number to attend on him, and to be ordered as those who attend on the Bishop of* Worcester. In *September* a Commission was given to examine and judge him. On the 24th of *October* 1551. an Order was made for seizing into the Kings hands the Temporalties of the Bishopricks of *Chichester* and *Worcester, lately given to his Highness by the Judgment given by the Commissioners, lately appointed for the hearing of the said Bishops Causes* 1552. *June* 15. A Letter was wrote to the Lord Chancellor; *Signifying to him, that Dr.* Day *late Bishop of* Chichester, *is sent to him by the Kings Appointment, to be used of his Lordship, as in Christian Charity shall be most seemly.* A like Letter was then sent to the Bishop of

London, for the receiving of Dr. *Heathe* late Bishop of *Worcester*, and an Order to the Warden of the *Fleet* to deliver them both to the Bishops appointed to receive them. The Archbishop seized the Spiritualties of the See of *Chichester*, void by the Deprivation of *Day* 1551. *November* 3. *St. w* saith, that the Sentence of his Deprivation was pronounced 1551. *October* 10. King *Edward*'s Journal placeth it on the 5th of *October*.

XXXIX. *Pag.* 203. *lin.* 3.

" This Year 1552. *Heath* Bishop of *Worcester* " was put out of his Bishoprick. He had been " put in Prison for refusing to Consent to " the Book of Ordinations. He was after- " wards deprived.

The Council-Book reports, that at a Council held at *Chelsey* 1551. *September* 22. Nicholas *Bishop of* Worcester *was sent for, to whom was repeated the Cause of his Imprisonment to be for that he refused to subscribe to the Book devised for the form of making Bishops, Priests and Deacons, being authorized by Parliament. At the time of which refusal, being not only gently required to subscribe, but also being manifestly taught by divers other Learned men, that all things contained in that Book were good and true, and that the Book was expedient and allowable; the said Bishop declared himself to be a very obstinate Man, and for that his doing it was now shewed to him, that he deserved longer Imprisonment. Nevertheless he was now offered to recover the Kings favour, if he would subscribe to the Book.* He answered,

answered, *Confessing he took the Cause of his Imprisonment to be as was alledged, and that also he was very gently used, rather like a Son than a Subject. Nevertheless that he remained in the same mind, not willing to subscribe it, although he would not disobey it: And although he was reasoned withall by every of the said Council* (there were present only Six Laymen) *in disproving his manner of Answer; being every thing in the said Book true and good, and being devised by Eleven other Learned men, to the which he was joyned as the Twelfth, and received of all the Realm; agreeing also that he would obey it, but not subscribe it, which contained a Contradiction of Reason. Yet he still refused to subscribe it. Whereupon he was offered to have Conference with Learned men, and to have time to consider the matter better:* Whereunto he said, *That he could have no better Conference than he had heretofore, and well might he have time, but of other mind he thought never to be. Adding, that there be many other things, whereunto he would not Consent, as to take down Altars, and set up Tables.* He was then expresly charged to subscribe before *Thursday* following, before the 24th of *September*, upon pain of Deprivation. Next follow the Orders of the 24th of *October* 1551, and 15th of *June* 1552. related in the preceding Article. King *Edward* in his Journal noteth, that he was deprived for Contempt 1551. *October* 5. The Register of Archbishop *Cranmer*, affirmeth him to have been deprived 1551. *October* 10. which is chiefly to be relied on, as being a Record with which also *Stow* agreeth, adding that the same day he was committed to the *Fleet*. He

had been impriſoned in the *Fleet* before this Day. For the Council-Book after the Relation of his Examination, and Anſwer on the 21d. of *September* addeth, that *as a man incorrigible he was returned to the* Fleet.

XL. *Pag.* 203. *lin.* 16.

" This Year the Biſhoprick of *Gloceſter* was " quite ſuppreſſed, and *Hooper* was made Biſhop " of *Worceſter*. In *December* before *Worceſter* and " *Gloceſter* had been united. So they were to " be ever after one Biſhoprick with two Titles. " But now they were put into another method, " and the Biſhop was to be called only Biſhop of " *Worceſter*. (So alſo *Pag.* 396. *lin. penult.*) *Hooper* " had not two Biſhopricks, but one that had " been for ſome years divided into two. He only " enjoyed the revenue of *Gloceſter*; for *Worceſter* " was entirely ſuppreſſed.

The Hiſtorian would have obliged us, if he had pleaſed to acquaint us by what Authority all this was done. It ſhould ſeem that *Hooper* had Poſſeſſion of the Revenues of *Worceſter* (I mean as much of it as the greedy Courtiers thought fit to leave to it) as well as *Gloceſter*. For in the Council-Book is found this Order, made 1552. *May* 29. *A Letter to* ..... *to make a Book to the Biſhop of* Worceſter *and* Gloceſter *of diſcharge of the Firſt-fruits, and Tenths to be paid for the ſame, in Conſideration that he hath departed with certain Lands to the Kings Majeſty.* Now *Hooper* had been Conſecrated Biſhop of *Gloceſter* in the beginning of the Year 1551. and therefore could now in

1552.

1552. be called Bishop Elect only in respect of *Worcester*. Nor could he now be charged with First-fruits, and Tenths, on any other Account, than of the Temporalties of *Worcester* newly received by him. Nor could he have passed away any of the Lands of *Worcester* to the King, if he had not once Possession of them. But to put the matter past all Dispute: I will alledge an Order of Council fully proving, that *Hooper* did enjoy the Revenue of *Worcester*. For 1552. *September* 24. the Council directed *a Letter to the Dean of* Worcester, *to cause the Rent-Corn of the Bishoprick to be reserved to the Bishop, notwithstanding* Hethe's *Claim to the same.*

Pag. 216. *lin.* 15. XLI.

"How *Tonstall* Bishop of *Duresm* was de-
"prived I cannot understand. It was for
"Misprision of Treason, and done by Secular
"men (in the Year 1553.)

What was done in the Case of *Tonstall* till the end of the Year 1551. was before related out of the Council-Book. I will here add out of the same Book, what afterwards occurs relating to him 1552. *September* 21. *A Letter unto the Chief Justice, signifying unto him, that there is presently sent to him the Commission addressed to him, and others, for the Limitation, and Determination of the Bishop of* Duresm's *Case; with also eight Letters, and other Writings touching the same, which he is willed to consider, and proceed to the hearing and ordering of the Matter, as soon as he may get the rest of his Collegues to him. By these Commissioners* Tonstall

was deprived on the 11th. of October 1552. according to King *Edward's* Journal. On the 31. of *Oct.* following it was ordered in Council, *that Sir* John Maſon *ſhould deliver to the uſe of Dr.* Tonſtall *remaining Priſoner in the Tower ſuch Money as ſhould ſerve for his neceſſities, untill ſuch time as farther Order ſhall be taken touching the Goods and Money lately appertaining to him; and that the Lord* Wharton *cauſe the Accompts of the Revenues of the Biſhoprick of* Dureſm, *as well for the ſecond and third Years of the late Biſhops entry into the ſame, as for two Years laſt paſt, to be ſearched for, and ſent hither with ſpeed.*

XLII. *Pag.* 216 *lin.* 8.

" *Ridley*, as himſelf writes in one of his " Letters, was named to be Biſhop of *Du-* " *reſme*, but the thing never took effect.

It ſo far took effect, that *Ridley* was actually tranſlated from *London* to *Durham*. For in the Inſtrument of the reſtitution of *Bonner* to the See of *London* in the beginning of Queen *Mary's* Reign, it is alledged that the See of *London*, was then void by the Removal of *Ridley* to *Durham*, made by King *Edward* after the Deprivation of *Tonſtall*, and *Bonner* was thereupon re-inſtated in *London* without pronouncing *Ridley* deprived of the See of *London*; but on the contrary *Ridley* is in the Regiſter declared to have been deprived of the Biſhoprick of *Durham*, for Hereſie and Sedition.

Pag.

Pag. 242. *lin.* 39. XLIII.

" *June* 1553. the Seal was on the 13th. of
" *August* given to *Gardiner*, who was decla-
" red Lord Chancellour of *England*.

Stow, who is very exact in denoting the times of things falling within the compass of his own observation, saith that the Seal was delivered unto *Gardiner* on the 23d. of *Aug.* His Patent for the Office of Lord Chancellour bears date on the 21st. of *September*, according to Sir *William Dugdale's* accurate Catalogue of the Chancellours, *&c.* of *England*, *Chron.* p. 88. With *Stow* agreeth *Grafton* herein.

Pag. 247. *lin.* 5. *Pag.* 248. *lin.* 35. XLIV.

" The Commission for restoring *Bonner*,
" bearing date the 22d. of *Aug.* was dire-
" cted to some *Civilians* —— who pronounced
" his former Sentence of Deprivation void.
" Thus he was restored to his See on the 5th.
" of *September* 1553.

Stow, and *Grafton* affirm, that *Bonner* was restored to his Bishoprick in the beginning of *August*, and that he caused the use of the Mass and other Roman Ceremonies to be renewed in his Cathedral Church on the 27th of *August*.

Pag. 249. *lin.* 17. *P.* 314. *l.* 36. *P.* 348 *l.* 38. XLV.

" *Cranmer* protested that the Mass was not
" set up at *Canterbury* by his Order, but that
" a fawning hypocritical Monk (this was

" *Thornton*

" *Thornton* Suffragan of *Dover*) had done it " *Anno* 1553, without his knowledge —— " *Thornton* Suffragan of *Dover* resolved to shew " his zeal (for Popery, *Anno* 1555.) This " *Thornton* had from the first Change made by " King *Henry*, been the most officious and for- " ward in every turn —— In the Month of " *June* 1557. Fourteen Protestants were de- " stroyed in two days by *Thornton* and *Harps-* " *field*.

There was but one Suffragan Bishop in the Diocess of *Canterbury*, of the Name of *Thornton*. He was Suffragan to Archbishop *Warham* in the Year 1508. and had his Title not from *Dover*, but *in partibus Infidelium*, and died long before *Cranmer*'s time. The Suffragan under *Cranmer* and *Pole* was *Richard Thornden*, sometimes Monk, afterwards upon the Suppression of the Priory, first Prebendary of the Church of *Canterbury*. He died in the end of year 1557, or rather in the beginning of 1558.

XLVI. *Pag.* 250. *lin.* 8.

" On the 13th. of *September*, *Latimer* and " *Cranmer* were called before the Council, *La-* " *timer* was that day committed, but *Cran-* " *mer* was respited till next day, and then he " was sent to the Tower.

If *Stow* may be believed *Latimer* was sent to the Tower on the 14th, and *Cranmer* on the 15th. of *September* 1553.

Pag.

Pag. 250. *lin.* 17. & 24. XLVII.

" There was an Order sent to *John a Lasco*, and his Congregation to be gone. *A-lasco* after a long and hard passage arriving " at *Denmark*, was ill received there. From " thence they went first to *Lubeck*, then to " *Wismar* and *Hamburgh*, and at last planted " themselves in *Friseland*.

A most exact account of the Foundation and Dissolution of this *German* Congregation in *England*, with their subsequent Removals, was written by *Utenhovius* one of the Ministers, at the desire of the Congregation, and is printed at *Basil* 1560, 86. with this Title. *Simplex & fidelis Narratio de institutâ & demum dissipatâ Peregrinorum aliorumq; Peregrinorum in Anglia Ecclesiâ, per Johannem Utenhovium Gandavum*, being approved by *John a Lasco*, and the rest, as a true account. From this Narration it appears, that although some of the Company went to *Hamburgh*, *Lubeck*, *Wismar*, &c. Yet that *Alasco* himself went not thither with them. He left *Denmark* on the 19th. of *November*, passed through *Holsatia*, and arrived at *Embden* the 4th. of *December*. He was accompanied with a Servant of the King of *Denmark*, by whom he sent back a severe or rather unmannerly Letter to the King. In this same Relation of *Utenhovius* is printed at large the Charter given by King *Edward* to *John a Lasco* and his Congregation; which the Historian had before mentioned, and put it into his Collection, *for the Curiosity of the thing*, Pag. 134.

thing, as himself saith: It was also published by Mr. *Prynn* in his Tryal of Archbishop *Laud*. I will further add, that it is more correct in *Utenhovius*, than in the Transcript; which is the Case of all the Instruments and Memorials published by him, which I have had occasion to compare either with the Originals, or with other Copies.

Pag. 394.

XLVIII. *Pag.* 251. *lin.* 2.

"*Cox* was without any good colour turned "out both of his Deanry of *Christ-Church*, and "his Prebendary at *Westminster*. He was put "into the *Marshalsea*, but on the 19th of *Au-*"*gust* 1553. was discharged.

Cox had no *Prebendary* (the Historian would have said *Prebend*) at *Westminster*, but besides his Deanry of *Christ-Church Oxford*, was Dean of *Westminster*, and Prebendary of *Windsor*; of all which he was deprived about this time. The cause of his Deprivation, was probably supposed to have been, that he had acted in favour of Queen *Jane*. For being a considerable Person in King *Edward*'s Court at the time of his Death, and having been much employed even in State Affairs, he could not well avoid to be concerned in that matter, if he were then present at Court. He was married indeed at this time. But I do not think that was alledged as a Cause of his Deprivation. For they did not yet proceed to deprive the married Clergy, until some Months after this.

Pag.

Pag. 252. lin. 28. XLIX.

"On the Fourth of *October* 1553. *Holgate* "Archbishop of *York* was put in the *Tower*, "no cause being given, but heinous Offences "only named in General.

I fear that *Holgate* by his imprudent Carriage, if not by worse Actions, had brought a Scandal on the Reformation. Most, if not all the Persons highly instrumental in the Reformation, were eminent for Vertue, but the probity of *Holgate* may justly be suspected. For in the Council-Book of King *Edward*, I find this Order made on the 23d of *November*, 1551. *A Letter to the Archbishop of* York, *to stay his coming up hither till the Parliament. Also a Letter to Sir* Tho. Gargrave, *and Mr.* Chaloner, *and Dr.* Rouksby, *to search and examine the very truth of the matter between the Archbishop of* York, *and one* Norman, *who claimeth the said Archbishop's Wife to be his Wife, to which end the Supplication of the said* Norman *is sent to them enclosed.* It is to be lamented indeed, that such occasions of Scandal were given by any eminent Persons of our Church (although to say the truth *Holgate* acted very little in the Reformation) but when they are given, they ought not to be dissembled by an Historian, out of favour or affection to any Party. To represent only the laudable Actions of men, is to write an Elogy, or Apology, or Panegyrick, or whatever other Name it may assume, the name of History it ought not to claim. And after all such Scandals (if indeed this were justly so) are no more prejudicial to the Honour of the

the Church of *England*, at and since the Reformation, than the scandalous Impurities of *Walter* Bishop of *Hereford*, *Stanly* Bishop of *Ely*, and many others, were to the Honour of the same Church before the Reformation. I know whither the learned Author of the *Defence of Priest-Marriages*, published by Archbishop *Parker* intends the Case of *Holgate*, when he saith, *I mean not to justifie the universal sort of the married Bishops, and Priests in all their light and dissolute Behaviour; whatsoever it hath been in any of them from the highest to the lowest.* —— *I think that I may speak it of the Conscience of some married Bishops and Priests in* England, *that they do as much lament the light Behaviour, shewed and escaped by some of them, in the Libertee that was granted them of Law and Parliament, as they that be most angry and out of patience with them.* —— *and beside forth bewail the dissolute Behaviour of a great many of their best beloved, and wish as hartely all Offendicles and Slaunders rooted out both sortes of the Clergie.* It should seem that in the Imprisonment of *Holgate*, this was alledged as one of those *hainous Offences*, which were the pretended cause of it. For in the Instrument of his Deprivation it is said, that he was *for his Marriage committed to the* Tower *and deprived.*

Pag. 190, 191.

L.

Pag. 257. lin. 16.

"On the 3d. of *November* 1553. Archbi-
"shop *Cranmer*, with others, were brought to
"their Tryal.

He

He was Arraigned and Condemned of Treaſon at *Guild-Hall London*, on the 13th of *November*, according to *Stow* and *Grafton*.

Pag. 257. *lin.* 28. LI.

"And now, (after his Attainture) *Cranmer* "was legally deveſted of his Archbiſhoprick, "which was hereupon void in Law.——— "But it being now deſigned to reſtore the Ec- "cleſiaſtical Exemption and Dignity to what "it had been anciently, it was reſolved, that "he ſhould ſtill be eſteemed Archbiſhop, till "he were ſolemnly degraded according to the "Canon Law (which was done in the middle "of *February* 1556.) So that all that followed "upon this againſt *Cranmer*, was a Sequeſtra- "tion of all the Fruits of his Archbiſhoprick; "himſelf was ſtill kept in Priſon.

This, if true, would be a matter of great moment, and make a conſiderable change in the Hiſtory of our Church. But really it is a meer Fiction. For immediately after his Attainture, the See of *Canterbury* was declared void, and the Dean and Chapter of *Canterbury* thereupon aſſumed the Adminiſtration of the Spiritual Juriſdiction of the Archbiſhoprick, as in other Caſes of Vacancy. The Attainture was compleated in the middle of *November* 1553. and on the 16th of *December* following, the Dean and Chapter of *Canterbury*, gave out Commiſſions to ſeveral Perſons for the Exerciſe of the Archiepiſcopal Juriſdiction in their Names, and by their Authorities. The Chapter continued in Poſſeſſion

of

of this Jurisdiction, till the Publication of Cardinal *Poles* Bulls of Provision to the Archbishoprick; *viz.* till the beginning of the Year 1556. and during that time gave Commissions to the several Officers and Judges of the Courts of the Archbishoprick, had the spiritual Jurisdiction of all vacant Bishopricks, gave Institution to all Benefices in them, and in the Dioceſs of *Canterbury*, gave Commissions for the Consecration of Bishops, *&c.* of all which Acts done a peculiar Register was made, Entituled, *Vacatio ſedis Metropoliticæ Chriſti Cantuar. poſt depoſitionem Thomæ Cranmer nuper Archiepiſcopi Cantuar. primo de crimine læſæ Majeſtatis Authoritate Parliamenti convicti, & deinde ob variæ hæreſes Authoritate ſedis Apoſtolicæ depoſiti, degradati, Seculari brachio traditi, & poſtremò in alma Univerſitate Oxonienſi igne conſumpti, ſub anni Domini*, 1553, 1554, *&* 1555. *regnorum vero Philippi & Mariæ Regum*, &c. During this time, all Acts and Instruments begin with these words: *Nocholaus* Wotton *utriuſque juris Doctor. Decanus Eccleſiæ Cathedralis, & Metropoliticæ Chriſti Cantuar. & ejuſdem Eccleſiæ Capitulum, ad quem, & quos, omnis & omnino da Juriſdictio Spiritualis & Eccleſiaſtica, quæ ad Archiepiſcopum Cantuarienſem, ſede plenâ, pertinuit, ipſa ſede jam per Attincturam Thomæ* Cranmer, *ultimi Archiepiſcopi ejuſdem, de altâ proditione attincti & adjudicati, vacante, notoriæ dinoſcitur pertinere.* Thus in particular beginneth the first Instrument of the Register, Dated 1553. *December* 16. Long before his Degradation also, the Pope had solemnly Excommunicated and Deposed *Cranmer* for Heresie: for it did not concern him

him to take notice of the Pretence of High-Treason. In the Bull of Provision to Cardinal *Pole*, to the Archbishoprick of *Canterbury*, dated 1555. *December* 11. Pope *Paul* saith, that he had by a solemn Sentence, Excommunicated and Deposed from the See of *Canterbury*, *filium iniquitatis Thomam* Cranmer, *olim Archiepiscopum Cantuar. ob notorias hæreses.* This Bull sufficiently disproveth the Historians relation. But that which is chiefly to be regarded herein, is the Register of the Vacancy before mentioned, which puts it beyond all doubt, that the See of *Canterbury* became void immediately upon the Attainture of *Cranmer*, and was at least in *England* so accounted.

Pag. 267. *lin.* 25. LII.

"The last thing I find done this Year 1553. "was the restoring *Veysey* to be Bishop "of *Exeter*, which was done on the 28th "of *December*. In his Warrant for it under "the Great Seal it is said, that he for some "just troubles both in Body and Mind, had "resigned his Bishoprick to King *Edward*, "to which the Queen now restored him.

The Register of *Canterbury* before-mentioned recordeth, that *Veysey* was restored to his Bishoprick, because he had been induced by fear to resign it in the time of King *Edward*. The Author of *Athenæ Oxon.* saith, that he was forced to resign *pro corporis metu* 1551. *August* 14. and was restored by the Queens Patent bearing date 1553, *September* 28. *Part* 1. *Pag.* 381.

LIII. *Pag.* 275. *lin.* 1.

"Thus were ſeven Biſhops all at a Daſh "turned out (in the Year 1554.) It was much "cenſured, that there having been Laws made, "allowing Marriage to the Clergy, the Queen "ſhould by her own Authority, upon the re- "pealing thoſe Laws, turn out Biſhops for "things that had been ſo well warranted by "Law.——And even the ſevereſt Popes, "who had preſſed the Celibate moſt, had al- "ways before they proceeded to deprive any "Prieſts for Marriage, left it to their Choice, "whether they would quit their Wives or "their Benefices.

In the Commiſſions given by the Queen for the Deprivation of theſe Biſhops, and related by the Hiſtorian; it is ordered to proceed againſt Four of them only for Marriage (*viz. York*, St. *Davids*, *Cheſter*, and *Briſtol*) but againſt the other Three (*viz. Lincoln*, *Gloceſter*, and *Hereford*) for other pretended miſdemeanors. Now in aggravating the Queens injuſtice, in depriving them Summarily for their Marriage; the Hiſtorian plainly miſtaketh the Caſe. For they were not ordered to be deprived ſimply for their Marriage, but for having broken their Vows of perpetual Celibate, and having married after a ſolemn Profeſſion of Chaſtity. This the Hiſtorian might have obſerved from the very Commiſſion for the Deprivation of the Four firſt (publiſhed by himſelf) the words whereof are theſe. *Quia comperimus Robertum, Archiepiſcopum Ebor. Robertum Menev. Johannem Ceſter. & Paulum Briſtol.*

Brostol. post expressam professione in castitatis, expressè, ritè, & legitimè emissam, cum quibusdam mulieribus nuptias de facto, cum de jure non deberent, contraxisse. The Secular Clergy of *England* had never indeed made any Profession of Chastity at their Ordination. But that all the Regulars did, is notorious. And however the severest Popes had, before they proceeded to deprive any Secular Priests for Marriage, left it to their Choice, whether they would quit their Wives or their Benefices; yet no such favour was ever allowed to the Regular Priests who had contracted Marriage, but their Marriage was accounted an heinous Crime, by reason of the Violation of their Vow included in it. It may be therefore observed, that the Queen giving Commissions at the same time, for the Deprivation of the Four first, and of the Three last Bishops, ordereth the former to be deprived for their Marriage, the later for their pretended misdemeanors, having taken Grants of their Bishopricks from King *Edward* the Sixth with this Clause, *quamdiu bene se gesserint*, although two of the Three later Bishops were married, and all the Four former Bishops had taken Patents from King *Edward* with the like Clause. The reason of this diversity of proceeding was because the first Four were Regulars, and the other Three were Seculars. That the later were Seculars is well known: and of the others *Holgate* of *York* had been Provincial of the Order of St. *Gilbert* of *Sempringham*, *Ferrar* of St *Davids* had been a Canon Regular of the Order of St. *Augustin*, *Bush* of *Bristol* had been Provincial of the Or-

der of *Bon-hommes*, *Bird* of *Chester* had been Provincial of the *Carmelites*. Of the three Secular Bishops (viz. *Lincoln*, *Gloucester* and *Hereford*) the two later were indeed married, but of that the Queen taketh no notice in her Commission for their Deprivation; although their Ecclesiastical Judges in depriving them, thought fit to alledge their Marriage, as one Cause of their Deprivation, not in Vertue of the Queens Commission but of the Canon-Law, which upon repeal of the Statutes for the Marriage of the Clergy, recovered its former force in this Case.

LIV. *Pag.* 275. *lin.* 24.

"For the Archbishop of *York*, though he "was now (in *March* 1554.) turned out, yet "he was still kept Prisoner, till King *Philip* pro- "cured his Liberty: But his See was not filled "till *February* next; for then *Heath* had his "*Conge d'elire*.

The Historian dateth the Queens Commission, by Authority of which he supposeth *Holgate* to have been deprived, on the 16th of *March* 1554. But the See of *York* was void before this. For the Dean and Chapter of *York* assumed to themselves the Archiepiscopal Jurisdiction (void by his Deprivation) on the 8th of *March* 1554.) He was discharged out of the *Tower* 1555. *January* 18. His See was not filled till *June* or *July* of the Year 1555. For however the *Conge d'elire* might issue out in *February*, *Heath* had not Possession of the Archbishoprick, untill his Election was confirmed at

Reg. Ebor.

at *Rome*, and his Bulls were publiſhed in *England*, which Bulls were not diſpatched till the 21ſt of *June* 1555.

Pag. 275. *lin.* 28. LV.

"On, or before the 18th of *March* this Year "(1554) were thoſe other Sees (St. *Davids*, "*Cheſter*, *Briſtol*, *Lincoln*, *Gloceſter*, *Hereford*,) "declared Vacant.

The Regiſter of *Canterbury*, in which all theſe Deprivations are recorded, teſtifieth, that on the 20th of *March* 1554. the Biſhops of *Wincheſter*, *London*, *Chicheſter*, and *Durham*, by Vertue of the Queens Commiſſion directed to them, pronounced the Sentence of Deprivation upon *John Taylor* Biſhop of *Lincoln*, *Ob nullitatem conſecrationis ejus & defectum tituli ſui quem habuit à Rege Edwardo Sexto per literas patentes cum hâc clauſulâ dum bene ſe geſſerit*, upon *John Hooper* Biſhop of *Worceſter* and *Gloceſter*, *Propter conjugium, & alia mala merita, & vitioſum titulum, ut ſupra*, upon *John Harlowe* Biſhop of *Hereford*, *Propter conjugium & Hæreſin, & ut ſupra*, upon *Robert Ferrar* Biſhop of St. *Davids*, *Propter cauſas ſupradictas*, upon *John Bird* Biſhop of *Cheſter*, *Propter conjugium*. No Sentence of Deprivation was pronounced at that time upon *Buſh* Biſhop of *Briſtol*. Whether he evaded it by renouncing his Marriage, or by any other Submiſſion, is uncertain. But he was never deprived. However, willingly or unwillingly, he reſigned his Biſhoprick in *June* following. For in the ſame Regiſter, the Dean and Chapter of *Canterbury*, aſſumed the ſpiritual Juriſdi-

ction of the See of *Briſtol* void; *per ſponteneam reſignationem Pauli Buſhe* 1554. *Junii* 21.

LVI. *Pag.* 275. *lin.* 32.

"*Gooderick* Biſhop of *Ely* died in *April* this "Year 1554.

He died in *May*, either on the 9th, or 10th day of the Month.

LVII. *Pag.* 275. *lin.* 41.

"*Hopton* was made Biſhop of *Norwich*. But "*Story*, that had been Biſhop of *Chicheſter*, "though upon *Day*'s being reſtored he was tur-"ned out of his Biſhoprick, did comply "merely. He came before *Bonner*, and re-"nounced his Wife, and did Pennance for it, "and had his Abſolution under his Seal, the "14th of *July* this Year 1554.

Day was reſtored to the Biſhoprick of *Chicheſter*, before the 16th of *March* 1554, (when the Queens Commiſſion was directed to him and others, in Vertue of which he with his Collegues deprived ſeveral Biſhops on the 20th of *March*,) whereas *Hopton* of *Norwich* was not conſecrated till the 25th of *Octob.* following. Beſides it is not certain, that *Story* was turned out of his Biſhoprick. The words of the Regiſter are ſomewhat ambiguous, but ſeem to inſinuate, as if he voluntarily reſtored to *Day* the Biſhoprick of *Chicheſter*, from which he had been ejected. I will not omit here to add, that his Pennance, if he performed any, was

not

not imposed so much for his Marriage contracted after Priests Orders, as for the violation of his Vow. For although it be not known of what Order he was, we are assured from Archbishop *Parker* (in the Catalogue of the Bishops of his time, prefixed to his History of the Archbishops of *Canterbury*) that he was a Regular.

Pag. 276 *lin.* 1. LVIII.

" The Bishop of *Bath* and *Wells*, *Barlow*, was " also made to resign; as appears, *&c.* though " elsewhere it is said, that the See was Vacant " by his Deprivation. But I incline it truer " that he did resign.

It is most certain, that *Barlow* did resign. For in the aforesaid Register is a Commission granted to certain Persons by the Dean and Chapter of *Canterbury*, to Act during the Vacancy of the See of *Bath* and *Wells*, which is there said to be void, *Per liberam & spontaneam resignationem Domini Willielmi Barlowe ultimi Episcopi & Pastoris ejusdem.* This Commission was giving between 20th. *December* 1553, and 25th. *March* 1554

Pag. 276. *lin.* 16, LIX.

" *Barlow* never Married.

A more unhappy mistake could not possibly have been made. For so remarkable a Marriage never happened to any Clergyman of *England*, as to *Barlow*. He he had Five Daughters, afterwards married to five Bishops.

The first, *Fraunces* was married to *Matthew Parker* Son to Archbishop *Parker*. After his Death, (which was in the end of the Year 1574.) she was married to Dr. *Matthews* Archbishop of *York*. A second Daughter of *Barlow*, was married to *Wickham* Bishop of *Winchester*, a third to *Overton* Bishop of *Lichfield*, a fourth to *Westphaling* Bishop of *Hereford*, a fifth to *Day* Bishop of *Winchester*: All this is declared at length in the Epitaph fixed to the Monument of *Fraunces*, who dying in 1629. Aged 78 years, was buried in the Church of *York*. So that *Fraunces* was born in 1551. in the Reign of King *Edward*, when her Father was Bishop of *Wells*. Besides these Daughters, *Barlow* had a Son of his own name, who was Prebendary of *Wyveleſcomb* in the Church of *Wells* in the Year 1571. being then in Deacons Orders. It appeareth farther, that *Barlow*'s Wife was alive, after that her Daughter *Fraunces* had married to *Matthew Parker*; so that notwithstanding the Historians reasons it is to be feared, that *Barlow* made some dishonourable compliance in the Reign of Queen *Mary*.

Reg. Faad. Parker.

LX. *Pag.* 276. *lin.* 31.

" When this was done (*viz.* after the old Bi-
" shops were deprived in the Year 1554.) the
" Bishops went about the executing the Queens
" Injunctions.—— In this Business none was
" so hot as *Bonner*. He set up the old Wor-
" ship at St. *Pauls* on St. *Katherines* day. And
" the next day being St. *Andrews*, he did offi-
" ciate himself, and had a solemn Procession.

Bonner

Bonner had reſtored the Maſs in the Church of St. *Pauls* on the 27th. *Aug.* 1553. as was before related out of *Stow* and *Grafton*. If St. *Andrews* day be the next day to St. *Katherine*, our *Engliſh* Calendar indeed wants great Reformation, which placeth it five days after St. *Katherine*. But it may be preſumed, that if the *Calendar* can retain any Friends to plead its cauſe, it may in this Caſe get the better of the Hiſtorian.

Pag. 276. *lin.* 46. LXI.

"The Clergy were now fallen on for their "Marriages. *Parker* eſtimates it, that there "were now about 16000 Clergymen in *Eng-* "*land*; and of theſe 12000 were turned out "upon this Account. Some, he ſays, were de- "prived without Conviction, ſome were never "cited, *&c.* They were all Summarily deprived.

The Hiſtorian would have obliged us, if he had pleaſed to acquaint us, in what Book or Writing *Parker* hath delivered this Account. The Teſtimony of ſo grave, and ſo worthy a Perſon would have excluded all doubt. In the *Defence of Prieſts Marriages*, wrote by an unknown Layman, and publiſhed by *Parker*; this Paſſage may indeed be found. *Is thus the* Fol. 6. *Honour of the Clergy preſerved, to drive out ſo many, twelve of Sixteen thouſand (as ſome Writer maketh his Accompt) to ſo great a Peril of getting their Livings, and this juſt at the Point of Harveſt?* Here it may be eaſily obſerved, that this Author will by no means vouch for the Truth of this Computation. It would in truth

truth be a very extraordinary matter, if 12000 Clergymen ſhould have married between the end of the year 1548, and the middle of 1553. I cannot affirm of my own knowledge that the account is extravagantly falſe, but am very apt to believe it. And in this belief I am confirmed; for that having had the Curioſity to compute how many Clergymen were deprived for Marriage in this Reign, in the Dioceſs and Peculiars of the See of *Canterbury*, I found the proportion far ſhort of this account. For whereas there are contained therein about 380 Benefices, and other Eccleſiaſtical Promotions, no more than 73 Clergymen therein were then deprived for Marriage, or any other Cauſe; which far from the proportion of 12 to 16, ſcarce bears the proportion of 3 to 16. Yet *Thornden* and *Harpsfield* were as vigorous in proſecuting the married Clergy of that Dioceſs, as any Zealots in any part of *England*. As for the ſevere and unjuſt proceedings againſt ſome of the married Clergy, related by the Hiſtorian; the Author before mentioned atteſteth the ſame thing. But when the Hiſtorian ſaith, *they were all ſummarily deprived*, I fear this is an Addition of his own. For this Author on the contrary ſaith, that a years time was allowed to the Clergy *to abjure their hereſy, and put away their Wives*: although in ſome places their enemies were ſo zealous, that they diſpoſſeſſed many of them before the year expired. The firſt deprivation, which I find to have been made on this account, was in the Church of *Canterbury*, by *Thornden* then Vice-Dean: who on the 16th of *March* 1554, deprived ſix Prebendaries

Pag. 13. 269.

Fol. 5.

bendaries (one of them the Archbiſhops Brother, Archdeacon alſo,) ſix Preachers, and two minor Canons of that Church. In the Regiſter of the Vacancy may be found many Proceſſes againſt, and Deprivations of married Clergymen; from whence it appears plainly, that the uſual forms of proceeding were, at leaſt in many Caſes obſerved, and that all were not *ſummarily* deprived.

Pag. 277. *lin.* 2. LXII.

" Nor was this all; but after they were " deprived, they were alſo forced to leave " their Wives: Which piece of ſeverity was " grounded on the Vow, that (as was pre- " tended) they had made; though the falſe- " hood of this Charge was formerly demon- " ſtrated.

It is true that the Secular Clergymen had made no Vow. But it cannot be denied that as many of the Clergy, as had formerly been Regulars, had made ſolemn and expreſs Vows. Now the Number of theſe was very conſiderable among the beneficed Clergy of that time; by reaſon that all Prieſts who had been ejected out of Religious Houſes, were enabled to hold Benefices; and that the King alſo, and other Patrons did more readily give Benefices to them, that ſo by that means they might diſcharge themſelves from the obligation of paying their Annual Penſions any longer to them. Theſe therefore were all forced to leave their Wives, unleſs they evaded it by any baſe compliance, by Connivance, or by the Favour of any

any great Perſon. But that any of the Seculars were forced to leave their Wives, I do no where find. Indeed it was neceſſary to all, who would continue in their Benefices, to renounce their Wives; but we now ſpeak of thoſe Clergymen, who had been already deprived of their Benefices. Againſt many of them Proceſſes were formed for their Marriage, which may be found in the Regiſter often made; but therein I cannot find any beſide Regulars, to have been deprived by the Sentence of the Court, or their Marriages to have been annulled. And accordingly in the Articles of Enquiry or Interrogatories to be adminiſtred to every married Clergyman, formed in *March* 1554. (when the perſecution of the married Clergy began in the Dioceſs of *Canterbury*) the firſt is, *Whether he had been a Religious, and of what Order, and in what Monaſtery or Houſe?* A Copy of theſe Articles I have given in the following Collection. Num. 8.

LXIII. *Pag.* 292. *lin.* 6.

" What Cardinal *Pole's* Inſtructions were,
" I do not know, nor is it falſly underſtood
" by Learned men, what was the Power of a
" Legate *a Latere* in thoſe days. But I found
" the Original Bull of Cardinal *Beacon's* Lega-
" tine Power in *Scotland*, and have given it a
" room in the *Collection*, though it be large,
" ſince, no doubt, Cardinal *Pool's* Bull was in
" the ſame form.

We have no ſuch neceſſity of borrowing light from *Scotland*. The Bull of Cardinal *Pole's*

Pole's Legatine Power is entred in the beginning of his Regiſter (kept at *Doctors Commons*) which ought in the firſt place to have been conſulted. I have cauſed it to be thence tranſcribed, and have put it into the following *Collection*. Num. 9. From thence it will appear, how falſe the Conjecture of the Hiſtorian is, that *Pole's* Bull was in the ſame form with *Beacon's* Bull, which he pronounceth to be without all doubt. For in truth they differ altogether both in matter and form.

Pag. 292. *lin.* 39. LXIV.

" The Queen was falſly believed to be with " Child. Notice was given of it to the Coun- " cil, who that Night wrote a Letter to *Bonner* " about it, ordering a *Te Deum* to be ſung at " *Pauls*, and the other Churches of *London*.

The Council wrote and ſent ſuch Orders not onely to *Bonner*, but to other Biſhops of the Nation, on the ſame day. I have in the Collection ſubjoined the Letter wrote by the Num. 7. Council to the Dean and Chapter of *Canterbury*, who had then the Spiritual Juriſdiction in that Dioceſs in the Vacancy of the See.

Pag. 297. *lin.* 33. LXV.

" Upon Cardinal *Pole's* being called over, " there was a Commiſſion ſent him by the " Great Seal, bearing date 10. *Nov.* 1554. " authorizing him to exerciſe his Legatine " Power in *England*.

The

This Licenſe bears date on the 10th of *December*. that year, as may be ſeen in the Cardinals own Regiſter, wherein it is enregiſtred. In like manner *Pole* afterwards obtained a Licenſe from the Queen 1555. *Nov.* 2d. to hold a Convocation (as the Hiſtorian relateth, *pag.* 324) in vertue of which Licenſe he ſent his Mandate to *Bonner* on the 8th. day of the ſame Month to ſummon a Convocation. In obedience to which, *Bonner* ſummoned the Clergy to meet on the 2d. of *December* following. Which I obſerve, becauſe the Hiſtorian in ſpeaking of this Convocation, hath not fixed the time of it.

LXVI. *Pag.* 313. *lin.* 1.

" *John Kardmaker*, that had been Divinity-
" Reader at St. *Pauls*, and a Prebendary at
" *Bath*, was burnt in *Smithfield* on the 30th of
" *May* 1555.

There had been Monks in the Church of *Bath*, until the Diſſolution of the Monaſtery. But ſince that time, neither Monks nor Prebendaries had any place therein. *Kardmaker* had been really Prebendary of *Wells*, and in King *Edward*'s Council-Book I find ordered 1551. *Febr.* 18. *A Letter to the Chapter of* Wells, *in favour of Mr.* John Kardmaker, *Chancellor of that Church.*

LXVII. *Pag.* 320. *lin.* 45.

" *Gardiner* Biſhop of *Wincheſter* was believed
" to be the baſe Son of *Richard Woodvil*, that
" was

" was brother to Queen *Elizabeth*, Wife to King " *Edward* IV.

Bishop *Godwin* delivereth a more probable relation (which he affirmeth to have received from a Kinsman of *Gardiner*) that he was the base Son of *Lionel Woodvil* Bishop of *Salisbury*: which *Lionel* was the Son of *Richard Woodvil* mentioned by the Historian. With *Godwin* agreeth *Mills* in his Genealogical Catalogue of the Nobility of *England*. Pag. 1117.

Pag. 321. *lin.* 44. LXVIII.

" *Heath* Archbishop of *York* had the Seals " in *Febr.* after, *viz.* in 1556.

Hethe received the Great Seal on the first day of *January* 1556. according to *Stow*. *Dugdale* also writeth, that he was constituted Chancellor on that day, alledging undoubted authority, *Claus.* 2. & 3. *Phil.* & *Mar.* *Orig. Jur.* *pag.* 90.

Pag. 339. *lin.* 3. LXIX.

" The Chief of these (faithfull Shepherds, " who were willing to hazard their Lives in " feeding this Flock committed to their care, " privately) were *Scambler* and *Dentham*, &c.

Had none of the old deprived Bishops then, who were at liberty, courage sufficient to do their duty herein? That would indeed reflect upon their Memory. I doubt not, that some of them performed their duty. At least I am sure, that *Harley* late Bishop of *Hereford* did; of whom Dr. *Humphreys* (sometimes his Scholar, *Vita Jewelli* *pag.* 70.

lar, afterward his intimate Friend) relateth, that under the Reign of Queen *Mary*, he inſtructed his Flock in Woods and ſecret Places, as a faithfull and holy Shepherd, preaching to them, and adminiſtring the Sacraments; and for this purpoſe lurking up and down in *England*, at laſt died like an exile in his own Countrey.

LXX. *Pag.* 327. *lin.* 25.

" It was thought, that *Pole* himſelf haſtned " the Execution of *Cranmer*. (who was execu- " ted in *March* 1556.) longing to be inveſted " with that See: which the only perſonal ble- " miſh I find laid on him.

I am very unwilling to believe, that a Perſon of ſuch eminent vertue, as Cardinal *Pole* is by all allowed to have been, could be guilty of ſo baſe an Action. The truth is, he could have no ſuch deſign. For it was before ſhewed, that the See of *Canterbury* had been actually voided immediately upon the Attainture of *Cranmer* in the end of the year 1553. After his Attainture at home, and depoſition and excommunication pronounced at *Rome* (of which I ſpoke before) he was dead to the Canon as well as Common Law. His natural Life could be no obſtacle to the advancement of *Pole* to the Archbiſhoprick. And accordingly that very Pope *Paul* (of whom the Hiſtorian maketh *Pole* to have been ſo much afraid, leſt he ſhould defeat his hope of the Archbiſhoprick, (if *Cranmer*'s Life were not quickly taken away) had by a Bull dated 1555. *Decemb.* 11. collated

Regiſter. Pole.

collated or provided *Pole* to the Archbiſhoprick of *Canterbury*, conſtituting him Adminiſtrator of the Archbiſhoprick till he ſhould be ordained Prieſt, and after that, appointing him Archbiſhop with full Power and Juriſdiction. Upon the reception and publication of theſe Bulls in *England*, (which was about the beginning of the following Month) *Pole* was to all intents and purpoſes fully poſſeſſed of the Archbiſhoprick, although he was not conſecrated till the 22d of *March* following, the day after *Cranmer*'s Martyrdom. The Hiſtorian reneweth this Charge againſt *Pole*, *pag.* 340, but there urgeth the ſame argument only, namely, his chooſing the next day after *Cranmer*'s Death for his Conſecration, which is of no moment; ſince *Cranmer* had in his account, and in Canon and Common Law, ceaſed long ſince to be Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, and himſelf had been poſſeſſed of the Archbiſhoprick above two Months.

Pag. 326. *lin.* 38. LXXI.

" Although Cardinal *Pole* had an only Brother *David*, that had continued all King " *Henry*'s time in his Archdeaconry of *Darby*, " he did not advance him till after he had been " two years in *England*; and then he gave " him only the Biſhoprick of *Peterborough*, one " of the pooreſt of the Biſhopricks.

Cardinal *Pole* had three Brothers; and this *David* was not his Brother. *Bacatelli* who wrote his Life, had been his Secretary and Domeſtick Servant, for near twenty Years

before his Death. He had reaſon therefore to know the Cardinals Kindred; and he affirmeth, that the Cardinal had three Brothers, *Henry* (Lord *Montacute*, condemned of Treaſon, and executed in the year 1538.) *Arthur*, (condemned for Treaſon in 1562.) and *Geofry*, (condemned in 1538, but neither executed) and two Siſters. Then whereas *David Pole* is ſaid by the Hiſtorian to have been preferred to *Peterborough, one of the pooreſt of the Biſhopricks*; in truth *Peterborough* was at that time none of the leaſt Biſhopricks in *England*, having been endowed by King *Henry*, far above any of the new erected Biſhopricks, and made equal in revenue to moſt of the ancient Biſhopricks; and ſo continued, until *Scambler*, the Succeſſor of this *David Pole*, did by a Simoniacal Contract, convey away the better part of the Poſſeſſions of it to a Noble Perſon of the Neighbourhood; that he might thereby make way for his own Tranſlation to the Biſhoprick of *Norwich*, to do the like Miſchief there.

LXXII. *Pag.* 340. *lin.* 20.

" On the 28th of *March*, *Pole* came in State " through *London* to *Bow-Church*; where the " Biſhops of *Worceſter* and *Ely* put the Pall a- " bout him.

He received, and was ſolemnly inveſted with his Pall at *Bow-Church*, on the 25th of *March*; as his own Regiſter teſtifieth; which is confirmed by *Stow*.

Pag.

Pag. 340. *lin.* 22. LXXIII.

" This was a Device set up by Pope *Paschal* " the second, in the beginning of the twelfth " Century, for the engaging of all Archbishops " to a more immediate dependance on that See; " they being, after they took the Pall, to act as " the Popes Legates born (as the Phrase was) " of which it was the Ensign. But it was at " first admitted with great Contradiction, " both by the Kings of *Sicily*, and *Poland*; the " Archbishops of *Palermo* and *Gnesna*, being " the first to whom they were sent, all men " wondring at the Novelty of the thing, and " of the Oath which the Popes required of " them at the Delivery of it.

I cannot sufficiently admire, that any learned Man should commit so great a Mistake. None, conversant in the History of the Church, can be ignorant, that the Custom of sending Palls from *Rome* to the Archbishops owning any Dependance upon that See, or Relation to it, began many hundred years before Pope *Paschal* the Second. Pope *Gregory* the First had sent a Pall to *Augustin*, the first Archbishop of *Canterbury*, and all the Archbishops from him to the Reformation did singly receive Palls from *Rome*, if sudden Death did not prevent them before the Reception. In like manner all the English Archbishops of *York* from the beginning (if we except two or three, who for that reason claimed not Archiepiscopal Priviledges) received their Palls from thence; and so also all the Archbishops of the Western-Church,

which held any Communication with the See of *Rome*. When they were first sent to Archbishops, and for several Ages after, no Oath of Obedience to the See of *Rome* was exacted at the Delivery of them. Thus the Historian is found to have erred in fixing the time of their beginning, and in affixing a constant Oath to them. But farther he hath widely mistaken the Design of them: which was not to constitute those, who received them, *Legati Nati*, to the See of *Rome*. For if that were true, all the Archbishops of *Canterbury* from the first Foundation of the See, almost all the Archbishops of *York*, and the other Archbishops of the Western Church, would have been *Legati Nati* to the Pope: whereas in truth, the Number of *Legati Nati* in Christendom is very small, not exceeding four or five; the Archbishops of *York* never were *Legati Nati*, nor the Archbishops of *Canterbury*, till about the Year 1200. When Archbishop *Herbert* first obtained that Priviledge to himself and Successors. Lastly, whereas the Historian maketh the Archbishop of *Gnesna* to have been one of the first, to whom the Title and Priviledge of *Legatus Natus* was conferred, and that by Pope *Paschal*: the contrary of it is so far true, that *Andreas Olzowski* Archbishop of *Gnesna* in his Letter wrote to Dr. *Sheldon* Archbishop of *Canterbury* in the Year 1675. (wherein he requests of him to send to him an account of the Priviledges of *Legatio Nata* belonging to the See of *Canterbury*) beginneth to propose his requests in these words. *Concessum olim erat Anno 1515. Privilegium Legationis natæ à Le-*

m

ne X. *Papæ Archiepiscopis Gnesnensibus Primatibus Poloniæ tali verborum contextu*, Concedentes, ut omnibus Privilegiis, *&c.* quæ ad Legatos Natos pertinent, & quæ alii Legati Nati, præsertim vero Legatus Cantuariensis in suis Provinciis, utuntur, libere & licite valeat uti, *&c.*

Pag. 360. *lin.* 17. LXXIV.

" The Parliament was opened on the 20th " of *January* 1558. In the House of Peers the " Abbot of *Westminster*, and the Prior of St. " *John* of *Jerusalem*, took their places accord- " ing to their Writs. *Tresham* was now made " *Prior*.

Thomas Tresham had been made Prior of St. *John* of *Jerusalem* by the Queen on the 30th of *November* 1557, as both *Stow* and *Fuller* witness.

Pag. 378. *lin.* 45. LXXV.

" In the beginning of the next year, (*viz.* " 1559.) the Bishops of *Norwich* and *Gloucester* " died.

They both died before the end of this year, 1558. For in the Register of *Pole*, I find that the See of *Gloucester* was void by the Death of *James Brooks*, 1558. *Sept.* 7. And in the Register of *Canterbury*, the Dean and Chapter of the Church, are said to have seized into their hands, 1558. *Decemb.* 24. the Spiritualties of the See of *Norwich*, void by the Death of *John Hopton*.

LXXVI *Pag.* 378. *lin.* 44.

" Thoſe now void, were the Sees of *Canterbury*, *Hereford*, *Briſtol*, and *Bangor*. It " was of great importance to find men able " to ſerve in theſe Imployments, chiefly in " the See of *Canterbury*. For this Dr. *Parker* " was ſoon thought on. He was writ to on the " 9th of *December*, 1558. to come up to *London*.

From this Relation any Reader would conclude, that the See of *Briſtol* was void before the firſt Deſignation of *Parker* to the Archbiſhoprick, *viz.* before the 9th of *December*. But that doth not appear. For the Spiritualties of the See of *Briſtol*, void by the Death of *John Holman*, were not ſeized by the Chapter of *Canterbury*, untill the 18th of *December*.

LXXVII. *Pag.* 293. *lin.* 48.

" Thus I have given the Subſtance of their " Speeches (of *Heath* and *Fecknam*, made in " Parliament, in behalf of Popery) being all " that I have ſeen on that ſide.

Beſides theſe, I have ſeen a long Speech of *Scot* Biſhop of *Cheſter*, delivered at the ſame time in the ſame cauſe.

LXXVIII. *Pag.* 396. *lin.* 7.

" It doth not appear, how ſoon after the " Diſſolution of the Parlament (diſſolved 1559, " *May* 8.) the Oath of Supremacy was put " to them (the Clergy and Biſhops.) For " the laſt Collation *Bonner* gave of any Bene- " fice, was on the 6th of *May* this Year.

It cannot be imagined, that *Bonner* was deprived before the Diſſolution of the Parliament. On what days the ſeveral Biſhops of the Province of *Canterbury* were deprived, may be determined from the times of the Seiſure of the Spiritualties of their Biſhopricks made by the Dean and Chapter of *Canterbury*; who then poſſeſſed and exerciſed the Archiepiſcopal Juriſdiction in the Vacancy of the See. Theſe I will here preſent out of the Regiſter of that Church. The Spiritualties of the See of *London*, void by the Deprivation of *Edmund Bonner*, were ſeized 1559, *June* 2. The Spiritualties of *Wincheſter*, void by the Deprivation of *John White*, 1559. *July* 18. of *Lincoln*, void by the Deprivation of *Thomas Watſon*, 1559. *July* 2. (theſe two Biſhops had been committed to the Tower on the 5th of *April* preceding.) The Spiritualties of *Ely*, void by the Deprivation of *Thomas Thirleby*, 1559. *Nov.* 23. of *Lichfield*, void by the Deprivation of *Ralph Bayne*, 1559. *June* 24 (he died before the end of the ſame Year.) The Spiritualties of *Exeter*, void by the Deprivation of *James Turbervil*, 1559. *Nov.* 16. Of *Worceſter*, void by the Deprivation of *Richard Pates*, 1559. *June* 30. of *Peterborough*, void by the Deprivation of *David Pool*, 1559. *Nov.* 11. of St. *Aſaph*, void by the Deprivation of *Thomas Goldwell*, 1559. *July* 15. When the See of *York* was firſt voided by the Deprivation of *Heath*, I ſhall relate hereafter. The certain times of the Deprivation of *Tunſtall* of *Durham*, of *Oglethorp* of *Carliſle*, and of *Scot* of *Cheſter*, I cannot find. In all 14 Biſhops were deprived;

to whom may be added one Suffragan, *viz.* *Pursglove* of *Hull*. The whole Number of the Clergy deprived at this time, is thus described by a Romish Dissenter, Author of *A sincere modest Defence of English Catholiques that suffer*, &c. Published in 1583. He saith that in *England* were deprived 14 Bishops, besides 3 Bishops Elect, the Abbot of *Westminster*, 4 Priors of Religious Houses, 12 Deans, 14 Archdeacons, above 60 Canons of Cathedral Churches, not so few as a 100 Priests of good Preferment, 15 Heads of Colledges in *Oxford* and *Cambridge*, and above 20 Proctours of divers Faculties therein. No great Number, to be deprived at a time of so great a Change in Religion. I am willing to believe the Computation of this Authour to be exact; because I find it to be so in the Number of Bishops and Deans deprived. The 14 Bishops we have named already. The Names of the 12 Deans follow. *Cole* of St. *Pauls*, *Stuarde* of *Winchester*, *Robertson* of *Durham*, *Ramridge* of *Lichfield*, *Goodman* of *Wells*, *Reynolds* of *Exeter*, *Harpsfield* of *Norwich*, *Holland* of *Worcester*, *Daniel* of *Hereford*, *Salkel* of *Carlisle*, *Joliff* of *Bristol*, *Boxal* of *Peterborough*, and *Windsor*. Of the three Bishops Elect, who are said to have been deprived, I can recover the Names but of Two, Viz. *Thomas Rainolds* Elect of *Hereford*, and *Thomas Wood*.

LXXIX. *Pag.* 396. *lin.* 11. *Pag.* 397. *lin.* 7.

"The Oath being offered to *Heath* Archbishop of *York*, *Christopherson* Bishop of *Chichester*, they did all refuse to take it.——They

"were

" were upon their refusal deprived and put " in Prison. —— *Christopherson* chose to live " still in *England*.

This is a fair Story. But what if after all, *Christopherson* died before Queen *Mary*? This is affirmed by *Pits*. At least it is most certain, that he died within six Weeks after her. In which time, Queen *Elizabeth*, far from depriving any Bishops, had not declared her Resolution in matter of Religion on either side. The Dean and Chapter of *Canterbury* seised the Spiritualties of the See of *Chichester* vacant *per mortem naturalem Johannis Christopherson ultimi Episcopi, & Pastoris ejusdem*, 1559. *Jan.* 2. Now although he should have died some few days before Queen *Mary* (as *Pits* saith) it is not to be wondred, if amidst so much Confusion, as attended the Death of the Queen, and Cardinal *Pole*, the Chapter of *Canterbury* neglected for some time to seize the Spiritualties of *Chichester*.

De Scriptor. Angl. pag. 753.

Regist. Canta.

Pag. 402. *lin.* 33. LXXX.

" On the 8th Day of *July* 1559. the *Conge d'Elire* (for *Matthew Parker*) was sent to " *Canterbury*. On the 22 of *July* a Chapter " was summoned to meet the first of *August*; " where the Dean and Prebendaries meeting " they all elected him.

The *Conge d'Elire* was sent to the Chapter of *Canterbury*, not on the 8th, but on the 18th of *July*; in vertue of which, *Parker* was elected on the first of *August* by the Dean and four

Regist. Parker.

four Prebendaries, then preſent in Chapter. The other Canons were either abſent, or refuſed to appear. But the Election was not thereby the leſs Canonical. For they had been all cited in due form to appear, and give their Votes.

LXXXI. *Pag.* 403. *lin.* 25.

" Some time after this, in *February* 1561. " *Young* was tranſlated from St. *Davids* to " *York*; there being now no hopes of gaining " *Heath* to continue in it; which it ſeems had " been long endeavoured, for it was now two " Years that that See had been in Vacancy.

The Hiſtorian finding, that the See of *York* lay void from the enacting the Oath of Supremacy two Years (not ſtrictly accounted) and not knowing the Cauſe of it, hath invented a plauſible Reaſon, and believed it as a matter of equal Certainty with any other Occurrence related by him. To aſſign proper and plauſible Reaſons to every Action, may add Beauty to a Hiſtory; but if liberty be taken to do this without any ground or warrant, little difference will be left between a Hiſtory and a Romance. *Heath* was actually deprived long before this. For on the 3d. of *February* 1560. (*viz.* in the beginning of the Year 1560.) the Dean and Chapter of *York* aſſumed the Exerciſe of the Spiritual Juriſdiction of that See, void by his Deprivation: On the 12th of *Auguſt* 1560. *William May* Dean of St. *Pauls*, *London*, was elected Archbiſhop of *York*. But he dying before his Confirmation and Conſecration, *Thomas Young*, Biſhop of St. *Davids*,

Regiſtr. Ebor.

was

was finally elected to that Archbishoprick on the 27th of *January* 1561. and confirmed on the 25th of *February*.

Pag. 403. *lin.* 23. LXXXII.

"*Parker* being thus Consecrated himself "(1559. *December.* 17.) did afterwards Con- "secrate Bishops for the other Sees, *Cox* Bi- "shop of *Ely*, &c. and *Par* Bishop of *Peter- "borough.*

There never was any Bishop of *Peterborough* of that Name. To *David Pole* succeeded immediately in that See *Edmond Scambler*; who was consecrated by Archbishop *Parker*, on the 16th of *February*, 1561.

Pag. 404. *lin.* 35. LXXXIII.

"Some excepted against the Canonicalness "of *Parker's* Consecration, because it was "done by all the Bishops of the Province, and "Three of the Bishops had no Sees when they "did it, and the Fourth was only a Suffragan "Bishop: But to all this it was said, That "—— a Suffragan Bishop being Consecrated "in the same manner that other Bishops were, "tho' he had a limited Jurisdiction, yet was "of the same Order with them.

When I first observed, that in the Arms of Archbishop *Parker* under his Effigies over-against *pag.* 402. the Keys were inverted (which he ever bore erect) I began almost to fear, that the Historian would deny the Regularity of his Consecration. But since he is pleased to

to do Juſtice to the Archbiſhop herein; I will add in Confirmation of what is ſaid concerning the equal Authority, which Suffragan Biſhops have to conſecrate with others; that the practice of the Church of *England*, before the Reformation will clear all doubts of this Nature. For the Archbiſhops in taking other Biſhops to their Aſſiſtance in the Conſecration of Biſhops, or in giving Commiſſions to other Biſhops to conſecrate in their ſtead, made no difference between Suffragan and Dioceſan Biſhops: So that I could produce above twenty Examples of the Conſecration of Dioceſan Biſhops in *England*, within Two hundred years before the Reformation, performed with the Aſſiſtance of Suffragan Biſhops, and that when the Canonical number of Conſecrators was not compleat without them.

LXXXIV. *Appendix.*; *pag.* 386. *lin.* 3.

" *Saunders* ſaith, that the Heads of Colledges " were turned out (under *Edward* the Sixth) " and the Catholick Doctors were forbid to " Preach. *The Hiſtorian anſwereth.* I do not " find that one Head of a Colledge in either " Univerſity was turned out.

I find ſomewhat relating to the Heads of Houſes in King *Edwards* Council-Book, 1550. 13th. October. *A Letter to the Fellows of* New Colledge *in* Oxford, *forbidding them to chooſe a Warden in Mr.* Coles *ſtead, without Licenſe from the King*, 1551. 29th. January, *Commiſſioners appointed to examine and try the Caſe of Dr.* Cole, *upon certain Objections made by the Fellows of* New

New Colledge *in* Oxford *againſt him*, 1551. March 25th. White *Warden of* Wincheſter *Colledge committed to the* Tower, *for receiving Letters and Books from beyond Sea, and particularly from one* Martin *a Scholar there, who impugneth*, &c. 1551. June 15th. *Dr.* Morwent, *Preſident of* Corpus Chriſti *Colledge*, Oxon, *with ſome of the Fellows of that Houſe, committed to the* Fleet, *for uſing upon* Corpus Chriſti *Day other Service than that is appointed in the Book of Service. A Letter to the ſaid Colledge ſignifying the ſame, and appointing Mr.* Juell *to govern the ſaid Colledge in the abſence of the ſaid Preſident*, 1551. December 22. *Dr.* Treſham *committed to the* Fleet. Or if expreſs Inſtances of the Ejection of any Heads be required, I will produce one in each Univerſity. In *Oxford*, Dr. *Richard Smith*, *Regius* Profeſſor of Divinity, and Principal of *Alban* Hall, was ejected in the Reign of King *Edward*. In *Cambridge*, Dr. *George Day*, Biſhop of *Chicheſter*, and at the ſame time Provoſt of *Kings Colledge*, was deprived about the ſame time.

Pag. 390. *lin.* 2. LXXXV.

" *Day* Biſhop of *Chicheſter* was judged by " Lay Delegates; ſo it is like his offence was " againſt the State.

I before gave an Account of the Deprivation of *Day* out of the Council-Book; from whence it appears that he was deprived for a matter of Religion.

Pag.

LXXXVI. *Pag.* 396. *lin.* 15.

" *Coverdale* was put in the See of *Exeter*, " upon *Veyſeys* free Reſignation, he being then " extream old.

The Record of *Veyſeys* Reſtitution to *Exeter* ſaith, that *metu olim eidem Epiſcopatui ceſſerat.* His Patent of Reſtitution alledgeth, that he had forced to reſign *pro corporis metu.*

LXXXVII. *Pag.* 396. *lin.* 17.

" *Ridley* and *Harley* were never married.

The Hiſtorian hence hath taken an occaſion to reproach *Sanders* for his little Exactneſs, becauſe he had reckoned theſe among the married Biſhops. But himſelf alſo is no leſs miſtaken. *Harley* was indeed married. For the Record of his Deprivation, ſaith, that he was *deſtitutus Epiſcopatu Hereford enſi ex conjugio & hæreſi.* His Marriage is further atteſted by *Fox.* Vol. 3. Pag. 19.

LXXXVIII. *Pag.* 403. *lin.* 43.

" *The Hiſtorian denieth, that the* whole Cler- " gy, who had engaged in, or ſubmitted to the " Reformation under King *Edward* were for- " mally reconciled to the See of *Rome* under " Queen *Mary.*

This is a miſtake. The Clergy were ſingly reconciled by formal and ſolemn Acts. To which purpoſe Cardinal *Pole*, the Popes Legate, gave Commiſſions to the ſeveral Ordinaries; one of which I have publiſhed in the *Collection.*

Collection. And not content with this, he prescribed to them a form, by which they should be reconciled. This also I have subjoyned in the *Collection.* Numb. 10. Numb. 11.

Pag. 403. *lin.* 1. LXXXIX.

"*Sanders* had said, that *William Thomas*, "Clerk of the Council had conspired to kill "the Queen; for which he justly suffered. "*The Historian answereth*, of this I find nothing "on Record; so it must depend on our Au- "thors credit.

If the Historian had pleased to have read our *English* Histories of these times, composed by *Grafton*, *Stow*, and others; he might have discovered somewhat of this matter upon Record. I before reported the Order of Council, constituting *William Thomas* Clerk of the Council, in the beginning of the Year 1550. King *Edward*'s Journal mentioneth it on the same day, *viz.* the 19th of *April.* Soon after, in reward of his Attendance, the Prebend of *Cantleury* in St. *Pauls* Church (lately conveyed to the Crown) and the Parsonage of *Prestbende* in *South-Wales*, were by the King given to him, when Queen *Mary* came to the Crown he was stripped of his Office, and perhaps of his Rewards also. In revenge of which he designed the Murder of the Queen: for which he was sent Prisoner to the *Tower* of *London*, 1554. *February*, 20. On the 26th of *February*, he endeavoured to murder himself, in Prison by a Stab: but the wound not proving Mortal, he was Arraigned and Condemned

ned at *Guildhall* on the 9th of *May*, and executed at *Tyburn* on the 18th of *May*. *Bale* endeavouring to extenuate the matter, saith, that he was condemned and executed for designing to kill *Stephen Gardiner*. But all other Historians agree, that it was for conspiring the Queens Death.

Scriptor. Britan. Par. 2. p. 110.

THese are the Errors and Defects, which I have observed in this History. For my performance herein, I expect not either praise or thanks from the present Age; much less from the Historian: yet I thought it a Duty owing to Posterity, not to permit it to be led into mistakes in any thing, relating to the Reformation of this Church, by Errors contained in an History published in our times, with Pomp, and seeming Authority. I do not suspect any Person to be so disingenuous, as to raise hence an Argument of my disaffection to the Reformation: or if any shall be so base, I shall slight the Calumny. The Reformation of our Church was begun and carried on with so much Piety, Wisdom, and fulness of due Authority; that a faithful and exact Account is the best Vindication, and Defence of it: nor should I ever have taken so much pains to rectifie the History, if I had not been fully perswaded of the Justice of it. If some favourable Passages in this History are by me disproved; the cause of our Reformation will not be really injured thereby, as not needing the Patronage of false or erroneous Relations. We were sufficiently able to defend the Justice of it, before any Forreigner undertook

took to deliver the History of it; and shall be so still, although the Reputation of his History should suffer any Diminution.

Lest it should be imagined, that I have examined this History so curiously, as to have discovered all the Errors and Defects of it, and to have left no room to after diligence, or the Enquiry of others; I do protest, that I never formed any Design of this nature until about a Month since. I have noted, what my Memory and present Collections suggested to me. But it may be easily observed, that I have considered only that part of the History which is purely Ecclesiastical, and not all that. If any one should take the Pains to examine in like manner, the Civil History intermixed therewith; it may be feared, that not a few Errors and Defects may be discovered in that part of it.

In the last place, if the Historian, or any for him, shall ask why, in Compliance to his Desire, expressed in the Conclusion of his History, I did not first Communicate the Papers to himself; I refer him for an Answer to the *Athenæ Oxonienses*, par. 2. pag. 625.

An Additament to Par. 2. Sect. 14.

In the place referred to I thought it sufficient to observe, that there appeareth no certain ground of the Marriage of *Richard* Bishop of *Chichester* reported by the Historian: But upon revising of the place, I think it not amiss to add, That we have undoubted certainty, that he never was married. For *Ralph de Bocking*, a *Dominican* Fryar, who had been his Confessor, and wrote his *Life* at large, hath these words of him. *Testis est Frater, qui hæc scripsit, cui ante paucos dies transitûs sui ex hoc mundo idem sanctus vitam & Commissa sua Denudavit, quòd ipsum sic carnis florem repperit custodisse, ut in eorum numero censeatur, qui cum Mulieribus non sunt Coinquinati.* And afterwards passing through the several parts of the Episcopal Office described by the Apostle, 1 Tim 3. *A Bishop must be blameless*, &c. and applying them to Bishop *Richard*, when he cometh to that part of the Apostolick Charge: *The Husband of one Wife*, he saith, *Ipse autem Richardus, Matrimonium Omnino refutavit.* Consonant to this Pope *Urban* IV. in the Bull of his Canonization, among other Arguments of his supposed Sanctity, maketh use of this. *Carnalis Conjugii voluptates, appetentibus anxius, Satietis plenitudine plenas, abhorruit; ut immaculati thori delicias Desiderantibus suaves & placidas, fruentibus gratas & avidas, obtineret.*

A

A COLLECTION

Of some few Records, and other Instruments, of which mention is made in the preceding Papers.

I. The Determination of the University of *Cambridge*, against the Supremacy of the Pope.

Invictissimo ac Potentissimo Principi ac Domino nostro, Clementissimo Henrico Octavo, Angliæ & Franciæ Regi, Domino Hiberniæ, &c.

QUod fælix & faustum sit, & huic florentissimo Regno tuo, & universo orbi Christiano, Invictissime Princeps ac Domine Clementissime, ex scripto prodimus, ac palam dicimus sententiam nostram in quæstione illâ famosâ de Romani Pontificis potestate; cujus quæstionis veritatem post maturam & sedulam examinationem, ac varias de re non uno tempore collocutiones, diligenti tandem Scripturarum collatione, & perpensione (ut nobis videmur) eruimus, & erutam, & Syngrapho quodam expressam, quod sententiæ nostræ & facti certissimus testis fuerit, Majestati tuæ unà cum literis istis nunc mittimus.

Atque hanc sane provinciam, Serenissime Rex, abs tuâ sublimitate nobis impositam, libenter suscepimus, partim ob eam quam Majestati tuæ debimus, fidem & obedientiam, quibus ullo loco aut tempore de esse nefas maximum putamus, partim ipsius veritatis amore ac studio, quam discere ac prædicare, quoties è Christi Gloriâ, & Reipublicæ Christianæ salute atque commodo esse videatur, cum omnium interfit qui Christo nomen dederunt atque in illius verba jurarunt, tum nostrâ multò magis referre interesseque videtur, qui quotidie in illius Scripturis versamur, quotidiè illius verba & voces legimus, qui est ipsa via, veritas & vita; quique veritatem custodit in Sæculum sæculi. Hujus favorem ac gratiam semper tuæ Celsitudini adesse precamur; optamusque ut nos, ut Academiam nostram, quæ tuæ semper voluntati fuerit obsequentissima, vicissim Sublimitatis tuæ favore prosequi, fovere atque ornare digneris. Christus Servator Serenissimam Majestatem tuam Diutissimè servet.

Universis sanctæ Matris Ecclesiæ filiis, ad quos præsentes literæ perventuræ sunt, cætus omnis Regentium & non Regentium, Academiæ Cantabrigiensis salutem in omnium Salvatore Jesu Christo.

Cum de Romani Pontificis potestate, quam & ex Sacris Scripturis sibi vendicat in omnibus Christianorum provinciis, & in hoc Regno Angliæ longo jam temporis tractu exercuit, hisce nunc diebus quæstio exorta sit, ac nostra eâ de re sententia rogaretur, videlicet, An Romanus Pontifex habeat à Deo in Scripturâ sacrâ concessam sibi Majorem Authoritatem ac potestatem in hoc Regno Angliæ, qua quivis alius externus Episcopus: nos equum esse putavimus,

putavimus, ut ad dictæ quæstionis veritatem eruendam omni studio incumberemus, ac nostram eâ de re sententiam ac censuram tandem orbi proferremus; nempe ad hoc potissimum Academias à Principibus institutas fuisse persuasi, ut & populus Christianus in lege Dei eruditatur, & falsi errores (si qui exorirentur) curâ & sollicitudine doctorum Theologorum penitus convelli ac profligari possint. Quamobrem de prædictâ quæstione deliberaturi more nostro convenientes ac maturâ deliberatione consilia nostra conferentes, quo modo & ordine ad investigationem veritatis certius procederetur, atque omnium tandem suffragiis selectis quibusdam ex Doctissimis Sacræ Theologiæ Professoribus, Baccalauriis ac aliis Magistris, eâ curâ demandatâ, ut scrutatis Diligentissime Sacræ Scripturæ locis, illisque collatis, referrent ac renuntiarent, quid ipsi dictæ quæstioni respondendum putarent; quoniam auditis perpensis, & post publicam super dictâ quæstione disputationem maturâ deliberationem discussis his quæ in quæstione prædictâ alterutram partem statuere aut convellere possent; illa nobis probabiliora, validiora, veriora etiam ac certiora etiam, ac genuinum ac Sincerum Scripturæ sensum referre visa sunt, quæ negant Romano Pontifici talem potestatem à Deo in Scriptura datam esse. Illis igitur persuasi, in unam opinionem convenientes, ad quæstionem prædictam ita respondendum decrevimus, ac pro Conclusione verissimâ asserimus. Quod Romanus Pontifex non habet à Deo in Sacrâ Scripturâ concessam sibi majorem authoritatem aut jurisdictionem in hoc Regno Angliæ, quam quivis alius Episcopus externus. Atque in fidem & Testimonium hujusmodi nostræ Responsionis & Affirmationis, his Literis Sigillum nostrum commune

curavimus apponi. Datum Cantabrigiæ in Domo noſtrâ Regentium ſecundo die menſis Maii, anno ab Orbe per Chriſtum redempto Milleſimo Quingenteſimo Triceſimo Quarto.

II. *The Bedes, or the antient Form of bidding Prayer.*

YE ſhulle ſtonde up and bydde youre Bedys in the worſhepe of oure Lord *Jheſu Criſt*, and his Moder Seynte Marye, and of al the holy Companye of Hevene. Ye ſhulle alſo bydde for the Stat of holy Cherche, for the Pope of *Rome* and of hys Cardinalis, for the Patriach of *Jeruſalem*, for the holy Lond, and for the holy Croys, that *Jheſu Criſt* ſendt it out of Hedne mennys honde, into Criſtin mennys honde. And ye ſhulle bydde for the Erchebiſchop of *Canterburie*, for the Biſcop of Worſſeſtre our Goſtlie Fader, and all odir Biſcopis, ye ſhulle bidde for Abbotis, for Priouris, for Monkis, for Chanonnis, for Frieris, for Ancris, for Heremytis, and for alle the Religiouns. Ye ſhulle bydde for alle the Preſtis, and Cleerkis that hee rinne ſerit, and haugty ſervit. Ye ſhulle bidde for the Pees of the Londe, that *Jheſu Criſt* holdit that it is, and ſendyt that it nys. Ye ſhulle bidde for the Kyng of *Engeland*, for the Queene, and for alle Childryne; for Prince, for Dukis, for Yerles, for Barronnis, and for the Knytis of this Lond, and for alle her good Counſale and and her trewe Servauntis. Ye ſhul bidde for hem, that the Stat of holy Churche, and of

this

this Lond be wel meinteined. Ye ſhull bidde for the wederyng, and for the cornis, and for the frutys, that beet, ikaſt on herde, and on enthe growynge, and for alle the trewe erthe tylyaris, that God ſende ſwic wederinge fro Hevene to Erthe, that it be hym to convenynge and mankende to helpe of Lif and Savacioun of howre Sawles. Ye ſhulle bidde for the Perſowne of this Churche and for all his Pariſchons that ben heere othere elles war, in Londe othere in watre; that oure Lord *Jheſu Criſt* ham ſhilde and warde from alle Myſowneris, and grauntte hem part of alle the Bedys and good Deedis that ben deed in holy Churche. Ye ſhulle bidde for hem that in gwode way beet iwent, odir wendyt, odir thenkit, to wen the heere ſennys to bote, that oure Lord *Jheſu Criſt* wold warde and ſhilde from alle Myſauntrys, and gronte han ſo goon and comen that it be him to worſhipe, and ham in remiſſioun of heere Sennys, for ham and for oos and alle Chriſtine folke. *Pater noſter*, *Deus miſereatur noſtri*, *Kyrie eleiſon*, &c. Alſo ye ſhulle bidde for the gwode man and the good wyf, that the Charite hider broche to day, and for ham that it furſt voondryn and longiſt holden. Ye ſhulle bidde for ham, that this Churche honoure with bok, with belle, with veſtiment, with twaile, odir with ligt, odir with eny odir ournement to roof odir to grounde, with londe, odir with rente. Ye ſhulle bidde for alle thilke, that bet in good lyve, that God the reinne ham holde longe, and for thilk that bet in evele lyve, other in dedliche Sinne ybounde, that oure Lord *Jheſu Criſt* ham out brenge,

and given ham Forgeveneſſe of har Senner. Ye ſhulle bidde for thilke that to God and to holi Chirche trewliche tethegeren, that God tham Wite and Warde from al Miſaintre; and for al thilke that evyl tethegeren, that God ham geve Grace of Amendment, that him ne falle naght in the grete Sentence. Ye ſhulle bidde for alle the Seeke of this Pariſche, that our Lord hem gyve ſive heele and help of Bodi ann of Sowle for ham, and for us, and for alle Chriſtmen, and Wymmen for Charite, *Pater Noſter*, &c. Ye ſhulle Knelen adoun, and bidde for Faders Sawle, for Moders Sawle, for Godfaders Sawle, for Godmoders Sawle, for God Childrens Sawles, and for alle the Sawlys of our Bredryn, and Sooſters Sawles, and for alle the Sawles, that we bet in Dette for to bid de fore, and for alle the Sawlys that beet in Purgatoree; that God ham brenge the radyr out of Harpeynys thorg the Byſeching of our bone. Ye ſhulle bidde for alle the Sawlys hwos bonys reſtin in this place; for alle Sawles hwos Mendeday beet yholde in this Churche, other ein other by the Yere. *De Profundis, Kyriei eleiſon, Pater noſter*, &c. *Amen.*

III. *A Proclamation of King* Henry *the Eight againſt the Marriage of the Clergy.*

THe Kyngs Majeſtie underſtandyng, that a ſewe in numbre of this his Realme, beyng Prieſts, as well Religous as other, have taken Wives and married themſelves, *&c.* His Highnes in no wiſe mindyng that the generalitee of the

the Clergie of this his Realme ſhould with the Example of ſuch a fewe numbre of light Perſoons proceade to Marriage without a common Conſent of his Highnes and his Realme: doeth therefore ſtraightlye Charge and Commaunde, as well all and ſingular the ſaid Prieſtes, as have attempted Mariages, that be openly knawen, as all ſuch as wil preſumptuouſly proceade to the ſame, that thei, ne any of them ſhal miniſter any Sacrament, or other Miniſterie myſtical; ne have any Office, Dignitee, Cure, Privilege, Profit, or Commoditee heretofore accuſtomed, and belongyng to the Clergie of this Realme; but ſhall be utterly, after ſuche Mariages, expelled and deprived from the ſame. And that ſuch as ſhall; after this Proclamation, contrary to this Commandment of their preſumpteuous mind take Wives and be maried, ſhall runne into his Graces Indignation, and ſuffer further Puniſhment, and Impriſonment at his Graces Will and Pleaſure. Given this 16th Day of *November* in the Thirteenth Year of our Reign.

IV. *An Account of the Proceedings in Convocation about the Marriage of the Clergy, wrote by* Matthew Parker.

IF ye lyſt to underſtande what was done and ſubſcribed unto by the Cleargie meeting in Synode together, and after debatement concluded, ye ſhall hear what the Lower Houſe did affirm in this caſe of Continence, *John Taylor* Doctor of Divinitie, bein then Prolocutor,

locutor, and *William Say* being Regiſter, to accept the Voices and Subſcriptions of them that were preſent, to whoſe Conſciences was this Propoſition propounded, either to be freely affirmed, or to be freely denyed by them, *Videlicet*.

"That all ſuch Canons, Laws, Statutes, "Decrees, Uſages, and Cuſtomes heretofore "made, had or uſed, that forbyd any Perſon "to contract Matrimonie, or condemne Ma-"trimonie, by any Perſon alredie contracted, "for any Vowe of Prieſthood, Chaſtitie or "Widohood, ſhal from henceforth be utterly "voyde and of none effect.

The Affirmantes of this Propoſition were almoſt treble ſo many as were the Negantes. Amongſt whiche Affirmantes, divers were then unmaryed, and never dyd afterwards take the Libertie of Maryage, as Doctor *Tailor* the Biſhop, Doctor *Benſon*, Doctor *Redman*, Doctor *Hugh Weſton*, Maiſter *Wotton*, &c. Of them that denyed it (notwithſtandyng their Superſcriptions to the contrary) as few they were, yet ſome of them took upon them the Libertie of Mariage not long after, as Doctor *Oken*, Maiſter *Rayner*, Maiſter *Wilſon*. Now yf any Man may fortune doubt of the Judgment of that notable learned Man, and commonly reputed of grave Judgment, I mean, Doctor *Redmayn* Doctor of Divinitie, he ſhall hear his very Judgment, which he uttered in the ſelf ſame Convocation, written in a Paper ſeverally by his owne Hande, yet extant to be ſhewed, and

and ſubſcribed with his own Name, and thus he ſaith.

" I thynke, that although the word of God " do exhort and counſell Prieſtes to lyve in " chaſtitie, out of the cumber of the fleſhe, " and the world, that therby they may more " wholly attende to their callyng; yet the " bande of conteynyng from mariage doth " only lye upon Prieſtes of this Realme by rea- " ſons of Canons and Conſtitutions of the " Churche, and not by any precept of Gods " worde; as in that they ſhould be bound by " reaſon of any vowe, which, (in as far as " my conſcience is) Prieſtes in this Churche " of *England* do not make. I thynke, that it " ſtandeth well with Gods worde, that a man " which hath been and is but once maryed, " beyng otherwiſe accordingly qualified, may " be made a Prieſte. And I thynke that for- " aſmuch as Canons and Rules made in this " behalf, be neither univerſal nor everlaſtyng, " but upon conſiderations may be altered and " chaunged: therefore the Kinges Majeſtie " and the hygher powers of the Churche " may upon ſuch reaſons as ſhall move them " take away the clogge of perpetual conti- " nencie from Prieſtes, and graunt that it may " be lawfull to ſuch as cannot, or wyll not " containe, to mary one Wyfe, and yf ſhe " dye, then the ſaid Prieſte to mary no more, " remaynyng ſtyll in his miniſtration.

Thus this Learned man, in ſuch credite univerſally in decydyng queſtions of Conſcience

V. Lat-

V. *Letter of the Lady* Mary, *to King* Edward *the Sixth.*

MY Duty moſt humbly remembred unto your Majeſty, it may pleaſe the ſame to be advertiſed, that I have received by my Servants your moſt honourable Letters, the Contents whereof do not a little trouble me, and ſo much the more, for that any of my ſaid Servants ſhould move or attempt me in matters touching my Soul; which I think the meaneſt Subject within your Highneſſes Realm could evil bear at their Servants hand; having for my part utterly refuſed heretofore to talk with them in ſuch matters, and of all other perſons leaſt regarded them therein; to whom I have declared what I think, as ſhe which truſted that your Majeſty would have ſuffered me your pooreſt humble Siſter and Bedeſwoman to have uſed the accuſtomed Maſs, which the King your Father and mine, with all his Predeceſſors did ever more uſe, wherein alſo I have been brought up from my Youthe, and thereunto my Conſcience doth not only bynde me, which by no means will ſuffer me to think one thing and doe another; but alſo the promiſe made to the Emperour by your Majeſties Council was an aſſurance to me, that in ſo doing I ſhould not offend the Lawes, although they ſeem now to qualify and deny the thing. And at my laſt wayting upon your Majeſty, I was ſo bold to declare my mind, and conſcience to the ſame; and deſired your Highneſſe,

neſſe, rather than you ſhould conſtrayne me to leave the Maſſe, to take my Life. Whereunto your Majeſty made me a very gentle Anſwer. And now I moſt humbly beſeech your Highneſſe to give me leave to write what I think touching your Majeſties Letters. Indeed they be ſigned with your own hand, and nevertheleſſe in my opinion not your Majeſties in effect, becauſe it is well known (as heretofore I have declared in the preſence of your Highneſſe) that although, our Lord be praiſed, your Majeſtie hath farr more knowledge and greater gifts than others of your years; yet it is not poſſible that your Highneſſe can at theſe years be a Judge in matters in Religion. And therefore I take it that the matters in your Letters proceedeth from ſuch as do with thoſe things to take place, which be moſt agreeable to themſelves; by whoſe (doings your Majeſtie not offended) I intend not to rule my conſcience. And thus without moleſting your Highneſſe any further, I humbly beſeech the ſame even for God's ſake to bear with me as you have done, and not to think that by my doings or enſample any inconvenience might grow to your Majeſtie or your Realm. For I uſe it not after any ſuch ſort. Putting no doubt, but to time to come, whether I live or dye, your Majeſtie ſhall perceyve, that myne intent is grownded upon a trewe love towards you, whoſe Royal Eſtate I beſeech Almighty God long to continue; which is and ſhall be my dayly prayer according to my dewty. And after pardon craved of your Majeſtie for theſe rude and

bold

bold Letters, if neither at my humble ſuit, nor for regard of the promiſe made to the Emperour, your Highneſſe will ſuffer and bear with me, as ye have done, till your Majeſty may be a Judge herein your ſelf, and right underſtand their proceedings (of which your goodneſs yet I deſpair not) otherwiſe rather than to offend God and my Conſcience, I offer my body at your will; and death ſhall be more welcome than life with a troubled conſcience. Moſt humbly beſeeching your Majeſtie to pardon my ſlowneſſe in anſwering your Letters. For my olde diſeaſe would not ſuffer me to write any ſooner. And thus I pray Allmighty God to keep your Majeſtie in all vertue and honour, with good helth and long life, to his pleaſure. From my poor houſe at *Copped-Hall* the XIX of *Auguſt*,

Your Majeſties moſt humble Siſter,

MARY.

VI. *A Letter of King* Edward *the Sixth, to the Lady* Mary.

RYght dear and right entirely beloved Siſter, we grete you well, and let you know that it greveth us much to perceave no amendment in you of that which we for Goddes cauſe, your Soules helth, our conſcyence and the common tranquyllytie of our Realm have

ſo

o long desired. Assuring you, that our Suffraunce hath much more demonstration of natural love, than contention of our conscyence, and foresight of our savety. Wherefore although you give us occasion, as much almost as in you is, to deminisshe our naturall love; yet be we lothe to sele it decay; and mean not to be so careles of you, as we be provoked. And therefore meaning your weale, and therewith joyning a care not to be found in our conscyence to God, having cause to require forgiveneesse, that we have so long for respect of love towarde you omitted our bounden dieuty; we do send at this present our right trusty and right well-beloved Counsalour, the Lord *Riche* our Chancellour of *England*, our trusty and right well-beloved Counsailour Sir *Anthony Wingfield* Knight, Comptroler of our Houshold, and Sir *William Peter* Knight oon of our two Pryncipal Secretaries, in message to you, touching the order of your howse, willing you to give them firme creditt in those things they shall say to you from us, and doo therein in our name. Geven under our Signet, *&c.*

VII. *An Order of the Privy-Council for a Thanksgiving for Queen* Mary's *Great Belly.*

AFter our hearty commendations unto your good Lordships, Whereas it hath pleased Almighty God among other his infinite be-

benefits of late most graciously poured upon us, and this whole Realm, to extend his benediction upon the Queen's Majestie in such sort as She is conceived and quick with Child, whereby her Majesty, being our natural Liege Lady Queen, and undoubted inheritour of this Imperial Crown, good hope of certain Succession in the Crown is given unto us, and consequently the great Calamities which for want of such Succession might otherwise have fallen upon us and our posterity, shall by God's grace be well avoyded, if we thankfully acknowledge this benefit of Almighty God endeavouring our selves with earnest repentence to thank, honour and serve him. There be not only to advertise you of this good news to be by you published in all places within your Diocese, but also to pray and require you, that both your selves do give God thanks with us for this special grace, and also give order that thankes be openly given by singing *Te Deum* in all Churches within our Diocese; and that likewise all Priestes and other Ecclesiastical Ministers in their Masses and other divine Services may continually pray to Almighty God so to extend his holy Hand over her Majesty the King's Highnesse, and the whole Realm, as this thing being by his omnipotent power, graciously thus begun, may by the same be well continued, and brought to good effect to the glory of his Name. Whereunto albeit we doubt not yee would of your selves have had special regard without these our Letters, yet for the earnest desire wee have to have the thing done out of hand, and diligently continued,

mied, we have alſo written theſe our Letters to put you in remembrance, and to bid your Lordſhip moſt heartily well to fare.

From the Court at *Weſtminſter*, the 27th Day of *November*, 1554. Your Lordſhips aſſured loving Friends,

S. Winton. Cancell. *Fr. Shrewsbury. Tho. Elienſ. Tho. Wharton. H. Arundell, H. Suſſex, R. Rich, Richard Southwell, Ed. Darby, Jo. Bathon.*

To our loving Friends the Dean and Chapter of *Canterbury*, and all other having Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction during the Vacation of that See.

VIII. Articuli ministrati Presbyteris conjugatis, Mense Martio, 1594.

PRimus an fuerit Religiosus, cujus Ordinis, & in quo Monasterio sive domo!

Item ad suis promotus ad Sacros Ordines, dum erat in Monasterio?

Item in quo & quibus sacris, & an ministravit in Altaris ministerio & quos annis?

Item an citra professionem suam regularem conjunxit se mulieri sub appellatione matrimonii?

Item cum qua, & in qua Ecclesia fuit matrimonii solemnizatio, & per quem?

Item quam duxit, erat resoluta an vidua?

Item an cohabitavit cum eâ in unâ & eâdem domo, ut vir cum uxore?

Item an prolem vel proles ex eâ suscitaverit necne?

Item an post & citra matrimonii hujusmodi solemnizationem assequutus fuit & est beneficium Ecclesiasticum habens curam animarum, & quot annos illud obtinuit?

Item an officio Sacerdotis post & citra assertum matrimonium hujusmodi contractum in Altaris ministerio se immiscuit, ac Sacramentis, & Sacramentalibus ministrandis se ingessit?

Item an præmissa omnia & singula fuerunt & sunt vera?

A Bull

IX. A Bull of Pope *Julius* constituting Cardinal *Pole* his Legate in *England*.

JUlius Episcopus, servus servorum Dei, dilecto filio Reginaldo Sanctæ Mariæ in Cosmedin Diacono Cardinali Polo nuncupato, ad charissimam in Christo filiam nostram Mariam Angliæ Reginam illustrem, & universum Angliæ Regnum, nostro & Apostolicæ sedis Legato de latere, salutem & Apostolicam benedictionem. Si ullo unquam tempore licuit, nunc certè expositissimè licet dicere, dextra Domini fecit virtutem. *Hanc inquam lætissimam vocem licet omnium piorum gaudiis atque acclamatione celebrare. Quid enim aliud dicamus, quàm dextram Domini hanc tam inopinatam rerum conversionem fecisse, ut florentissimum Angliæ Regnum, ab Henrico Octavo in dissidium ab Ecclesiâ Catholicâ secessionemque seductum, ac deinde Edwardi ejus nati successione in paterno & hæreditario errore corroboratum & firmatum, in tum nunc statum repentè devenerit, ut ad sanctum ovile atque ad Ecclesiæ Catholicæ septa revocari facillimè posse videatur. Profectò hoc nihil aliud est quam mutatio dextræ Excelsi. Defuncto enim vitæ supradictæ Edwarde, admisisque illius sectatoribus qui rerum habenas, qui arces, qui exercitum, qui classem obtinebant Regnum alicui ex suâ secta deferre, exclusâ legitimâ hærede, charissimâ in Christo filiâ Mariâ Angliæ Reginâ, illustri tunc Principe, præfati Henrici & Regis natâ, quæ semper in Catholicæ fidei unitate permansit, atque ut eis videbatur, voto jam potitis; Ecce ille Domi-*

nator Dominus, & terribilis qui aufert Spiritum Principum, *cuncta iniquorum commenta disjecit, & repentinâ animorum totius Regni inclinatione atque motu, eâ quam ipsi constituerant Regiâ potestate dejectâ, ut ipsa Maria unâ omnium voce Regina saluaretur, effecit. Gratia Domino Deo nostro, qui non obliviscitur suo; qui & huic illustrissimum prænium fidei suæ invictæque constantiæ, paternum Regnum, quod jam humanitus amiserat, divinitus detulit & hanc non parvam gregis sui partem, à rectâ semitâ jam pridem ab actam, & per deserta dispersam, respicere dignatus est. Quam & non dubitamus eodem divino favore perseverante, postquam Catholicam Principem nacta est, etiam ipsam in Catholicæ fidei viam facile conversum iri & communioni Ecclesiæ restitutum. Cui quidem spei sanctæque fiduciæ, quam habemus in Domino, nos pro pastorali, quæ nobis est ab illo commissa, universalis Ecclesiæ curâ, & pro eâ charitate qua erga Anglicam gentem propriè debemus affici, tamque hujus sanctæ sedis, cui sine meritis ullis nostris, sed solâ summi Dei Providentiâ præsidemus, peculiarem filiam, procuratâ olim ab ipsius sede divini illic verbi dissemination generatam deesse nec volumus nec debemus. Cùm igitur super hujusmodi tractandâ re, negotioque divinâ ope conficiendo & patissimum cui hanc provinciam demandare possemus, assiduos nostræ mentis cogitatus effunderemus; Tu semper nobis non tamen primus, sed solus omnium, occurristi, quem omnino præ cæteris huic curæ præficere debemus. Unde habitâ super his cum venerabilibus Fratribus nostris Sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ Cardinalibus, deliberatione maturâ, de illorum unanimis assensu & consensu, te ad eandem Reginam Mari-*

am

am & universum Angliæ Regnum nostrum & Apostolicæ sedis Legatum delegimus. Sive enim nos natalis terra tua, & omnium charitatem, quæ in te summa esse debet, & certè est, seu linguæ ejus gentis & morum sensumque notitiam, sive ob deductum à sanguine regio genus auctoritatem & gratiam, seu singularem in omni genere prudentiam & eloquentiam, seu (quod caput est) flagrantissimum tuum erga Deum & Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum ejusque sanctam Ecclesiam Catholicam amorem atque observantiam, multis jam in rebus cognitam atque perspectam, spectaremus; Personæ tuam, quam his quæ modo commemoravimus, & pluribus aliis, virtutibus, omnium munerum largitor Altissimus exornavit, ad hanc Legationem aptissimam judicavimus. Quamobrem Circumspectioni vestræ per præsentes Litteras mandamus; ut munus istud præstandum tuâ erga Deum pietate erga nos & sanctam hanc Sedem reverentiâ, erga Christianam Rempublicam studio atque amore, suscipiens, id pro tuâ fide, diligentiâ, dexteritate exequare; nihilque prætermittas, quo minus Deo bene juvante optatum Legationis fructum assequare, in eorum ipsos consolando, atque in Dei gratiam & sanctæ Catholicæ Ecclesiæ communionem restituendo. Cujus rei, maximè scilicet in ipsius Dei clementiâ, secundum Deum autem cùm in studio, prudentiâ & virtute tuâ, tum ipsius Mariæ Reginæ in Deum pietate, sapientia & devotione, spem ponimus. Dat. Romæ apud sanctum Marcum, anno Incarnationis Dominicæ millesimo quingentesimo quinquagesimo tertio, Nonis Augusti, Pontificatus nostri anno quarto.

X. A Commission given by Cardinal *Pole* for the reconciliation of Clergy and Laity.

Commissio Reginaldi Cardinalis Poli Legati de Latere.

REginaldus miseratione divinâ sanctæ Mariæ in Cosmedin sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ Diaconus Cardinalis Polus nuncupatus, sanctiss. Domini nostri Papæ & Sedis Apostolicæ ad serenissimos Philippum & Mariam Angliæ Reges & universum Angliæ Regnum, de Latere Legatus, venerabilibus ac nobis in Christo dilectis Decano & Capitulo Ecclesiæ Metropolitanæ Christi Cantuar. ad quos omnis & omnimoda Jurisdictio spiritualis & ecclesiastica quæ ad Archiepiscopum Cantuar. sede plena pertinuit, ipsâ sede jam vacante notoriè dinoscitur pertinere, seu eorum in spiritualibus Vicario Generali, salutem in Domino sempiternam. Cum sanctissimo in Christo Pater Dominus noster Dominus Julius divinâ providentia Papa tertius, inter alias facultates pro hujus Regni omniumque personarum in eo existentium sanctæ Ecclesiæ reconciliatione faciendâ, necessarias nobis in hac nostrâ Legatione concessas, hanc specialiter indulserit, ut quoscunque in hæreseum & Sebismatis errores lapsos ab eis & a quibuscunque censuris & pœnis propterea incursis absolvere, & cum eis super Irregularitate præmissâ occasione contractâ dispensare, & alia multa ad hæc necessaria seu quomodolibet opportuna facere, & hoc

idem

idem munus Catholicis locorum Ordinariis & aliis personis Deum timentibus, fide insignibus, & literarum scientiâ præditis, demandere possimus; prout in ejus literis tam sub plumbo quam in formâ Breves expeditis plenius continetur. Cumque Dei benignitate & Serenissimorum Regum pietate Regnum hoc in universaliter & omnes Domini Spirituales & Temporales, aliæque personæ communitatum in eo quod proxime celebratum est Parliamento congregatæ, singulariter primâ, & deinde universum corpus Cleri Provinciæ Cantuariensis, & omnes fere personæ singulares dictum corpus representates, coram nobis existentes, aliæque pleræque fuerint Sanctæ Ecclesiæ Catholicæ per nos ipsos reconciliatæ; speremusque fore, ut omnes aliæ, quæ reconciliatæ adhuc non sunt, reconciliari debeant, defficileque & potius impossibile sit ut tam numerosa multitudo per manus nostras reconcilietur; ideoque vices nostras in hoc locorum Ordinariis & aliis personis ut supra qualificatis delegandas duximus. Circumspectioni igitur vestræ, de cujus probitate & charitatis zelo plenam in Domino fiduciam obtinemus, auctoritate Apostolicâ nobis per literas ejusdem Sanctissimi Domini nostri Papæ & per nos vobis nunc impensâ, omnes & singulos utriusque sexûs tam Laicas quam Ecclesiasticas, singulares & quorumvis Ordinum Regulares, vestræ, civitatis & Diœcesis personas Seculares, in quibusvis etiam sacris Ordinibus constitutas, cujuscunque status & qualitatis existant, etiamsi Capitulum, Collegium, Universitas seu Communitas fuerit, quarumvis Hæresium, aut novarum Sectarum Professores, aut in eis culpabiles vel suspectas, ac credentes receptatores atque fautores ipsorum, suos errores agnoscentes, ac de illis dolentes, & ad Orthodoxam fi-

dem recipi humiliter postulantes, cognitâ in ipsis verâ & non fictâ aut non simulata pœnitentia ab omnibus & singulis Hæresum, Schismatis, & ab orthodoxa fide Apostasiarum & Blasphemiarum & aliorum quorumcunque similium errorum, etiam sub generali sermone non venientium, peccatis, criminibus, excessibus & delictis (de quibus tamen non inquisiti, vel accusati, seu condemnati non fuerint) & quibus vis Excommunicationis, suspensionis & Interdictorum & aliis Ecclesiasticis & temporalibus censuris & pœnis in eas præmissorum ac infra Scriptorum occasione aut jure, vel ab homine latis vel promulgatis, etiamsi eis pluribus annis inseruerint, & earum absolutio dicta sedi, etiam per literas in die cœna Domini legi consuetas, reservata existat in utroque, conscientiæ & contentioso foro; eos vero, qui jam inquisiti vel accusati aut condemnati fuerint, vel ut præfertur, ad cor revertentes, in foro conscientiæ tantum plenarie absolventes & liberantes, necnon cum eis super irregularitate per eos occasione præmissorum contractâ etiam quia sic Legati Missas & alia divina Officia, etiam contra ritus & cæremonias hactenus probatas & usitatas, celebraverint, aut illis aliàs se immiscuerint, contracta; quodque irregularitate & aliis præmissis non obstantibus, in suis Ordinibus, etiamsi ab Hæreticis & Schismaticis Episcopis, etiam minus ritè, dummodo in eorum collatione Ecclesiæ forma & intentio sic servata, per eos susceptis, & in eorum susceptione etiam juramentum contra Papatum Romanum præstiterint, etiam in altaris ministerio ministrare, ac quacunque, quotcunque & qualiacunque, etiam curata, invicem tamen se compatientia, Beneficia Secularia vel Regularia (Dignitatibus in Collegiatis Ecclesiis principalibus & in

Cathe-

Cathedralibus etiam Metropolitanis post Pontificalem Majoribus exceptis) etiam Schismaticis Episcopis, seu aliis Collatoribus, etiam laicalu potestatis prætextu habita, auctoritate Apostolica retinere, dummodo alteri jus quæsitum non sit, & non promoti ad omnes, etiam sacros Presbyteratûs Ordines, à suis Ordinariis, se digni & idonei reperti fuerint, rite & legitimè promoveri, ac Beneficia Ecclesiastica, etiam Curata, si eis aliàs canonicæ conferantur, recipere & retinere valeant, qualitate temporis, Ministrorum defectu, & Ecclesiæ necessitatibus, utilitatibusque ita poscentibus, dispensandi & indulgendi ac omnem inhabilitatis & infamiæ maculam, sive notam, ex præmissis quomodolibet insurgentem, penitus & omnino abolendi, necnon in pristinum & eum quò antæ præmissa quomodolibet erant, statum, ita ut omnibus & singulis gratiis, privilegiis, favoribus & indultis; quibus cæteri Christi fideles gaudent & gaudere quomodolibet possunt, uti & gaudere valeant in omnibus & per omnia perinde ac si à fide Catholicâ nunquam in aliquo defecissent, restituendi reponendi & redintegrandi; ac eis dummodo corde contriti, sua errata & excessus Circumspectioni vestræ; seu alicui alteri, per eos eligendo Catholico Confessori Sacramentaliter confiteantur, ac pœnitentiam salutarem eis pro præmissis injungendam omnino adimpleant) omnem publicam confessionem, abjurationem, renuntiationem, & pœnitentiam, jure debitas, arbitrio vestro moderandi, vel in totum remittendi; Necnon quoscunque Regulares & Religiosos, extra eorum Regularia loca absque sedis Apostolicæ licentiâ vagantes, ab Apostasiæ reatu aliisque censuris & pœnis Ecclesiasticis per eos propterea, etiam juxta suorum Ordinum instituta incursis, injunctâ eis pro modo culpæ pœnitentia

tentiâ salutari, pariter absolvendi, & super quacumque irregularitate propterea per eos contractâ, aut cum eis, ut alicui Curato Beneficio de illius obtinentis consensit, etiam in habitu Clerici Sæcularis, habitum suum Regularem sub honesta toga Presbyteri Sæcularis deferentes, deservire & extra eadem loca Regularia remanere ad beneplacitum nostrum libere & licitè possint, eadem auctoritate Apostolicâ, ob defectum Ministrorum & aliae prædictæ causæ, dispensandi, ac quoscunque qui in sacris Ordinibus constituti, Matrimonia, etiam cum viduis & corruptis mulieribus, de facto contraxerint, postquam mulieres sic copulatas rejecerint illisque abjuraverint, ab hujusmodi excessibus & Excommunicationis sententiâ, impositâ eis pro modo culpæ pœnitentiâ salutari, in forma Ecclesiæ consuetâ absolvendi, ac cum eis postquam pœnitentiam peregerint & continentur ac laudabiliter vivere cogniti fuerint, super bigamiâ propterea per eos contractâ, ita ut ea non obstante in suscipiendis Ordinibus etiam in Altaris Ministerio, Ministrare, ac alicui Beneficio Ecclesiastico, de illius obtinentis consensu, deservire, extra tamen Diœcesin in qua fuerint copulati, eisdem de causis dispensandi, necnon Parochialium Ecclesiarum tuæ Diœcesis Rectores sive Curatos, de quorum fide, probitate, Circumspectione & Charitatis zelo plena fiducia concipi possit, ad quarumcunque utriusque sexûs suæ Parochiæ personarum Laicarum tantum Absolutionem & Ecclesiæ Catholicæ reconciliationem (ut præfertur) auctoritate Apostolicâ faciendam, & si qui ex Curatis prædictis ad id idonei non fuerint, in eorum defectum aliae idoneas & sufficientes personas, quæ eorum vicem suppleant, nominandi & deputandi, quos sic per vos nominatos & deputatos in locum nostrum in præmissis

missis Absolutionibus & Reconciliationibus Substituimus, eisque vices nostras Subdeligamus, plenam & liberam auctoritate Apostolicâ nobis (ut præmittitur) concessa tenore Præsentium concedimus facultatem; vosque in præmissis omnibus in nostrum locum Substituimus: præmissis ac Regulâ de Insordescentibus edita, & quibusvis aliis Constitutionibus & Ordinationibus Apostolicis, & omnibus, illis quæ in Literis prædictis, Sanctitas sua voluit non obstare, contrariis non obstantibus quibuscunque; præsentibus in præteritis casibus locum habentibus, & ad bene placitum nostrum duraturis. Dat. Lambethi prope Londinum, Wintoniensis Diocesis, anno à Nativitate Domini Millesimo quingentesimo, quinquagesimo quinto, Idibus Februarii, Pontificatûs Sanctissimi in Christo Patris & Domini nostri Julii divina Providentiæ Papæ tertii anno quinto.

Reg. Card. Polus Leg.

XI. Instructions subjoyned by Cardinal Polo to the foregoing Commission.

Singuli Domini Episcopi, necnon Officiales Ecclesiarum quæ nunc vacant, pro executione eorum, quæ à Reverendissimo Domino Legato sunt eis demandata, ordinem, qui infra scriptis est, poterunt observare.

Primum, vocatum ad se totum singularum Civitatum, quibus singuli præsunt, Clerum de his quæ sequuntur instruere procurabunt.

De paterno amore & charitate, quam Sanctissimus Dominus noster Julius Papa tertius erga Nationem Anglicam

cum declaravit, qui ut primum cognovit Serenissimam Mariam Reginam declaratam, Reverendissimum Dominum Reginaldum Cardinalem Polum de suo latere ad has partes Legatum misit, ut Regnum hoc tot jam annos ab Ecclesia Catholica separatum ad ejus unionem reducere, & in errores lapsos consolari, atque in Dei gratiam restituere studeret.

De ejusdem Domini Legati adventu, quantâ lætitiâ & honore is acceptus fuit, tum à Serenissimis, tum ab aliis omnibus.

De his quæ in proximo Parliamento acta & concluſa sunt, scilicet de omnibus Dominis de Parliamento & universo Regno à Schismate & censuris incursis absoluto, & Ecclesiæ Catholicæ reconciliato, de omnibus Legibus, quæ contra auctoritatem sedis Apostolicæ & Romani Pontificis fuerunt per Henricum Octavum & Edwardum sextum latæ & promulgatæ, revocatis & abolitis; de restitutâ sanctissimo Domino nostro Papæ & Ecclesiæ Romanæ eâdem obedientiâ, quâ ante hoc pernitiosissimum Schisma præstabatur.

De authoritate Episcopis restitutâ, & maxime ut possint contra Hæreticos & Schismaticos procedere, & eos juxta Canonicas sanctiones coercere & punire.

His itaque expositis, veniant ad Facultates sibi ab eodem Reverendiss. Domino Legato concessas, quæ recitentur & hic omnes, qui in Schisma vel alios errores lapsi sunt, invitentur ad absolutionem, & conciliationem humiliter ex toto corde petendam; necnon dispensationes tam super Ordinibus quam super Beneficiis necessarias & opportunas postulandas. Deinde præfigatur dies, intra quem dicti de Clero humiles & pœnitentes compareant ad petendam supplices absolutionem, reconciliationem & dis-

dispensationes prædictas. Idem vero Domini Episcopi, postquam illi omnibus suis erroribus renunciaverint, & promiserint sacramentaliter ipsis aut alteri Sacerdoti Catholico confessuros esse errores suos, & pœnitentiam sibi injungendam adimpleturos, eos absolvent & Ecclesiæ reconciliabunt; & cum ipsis juxta formam Facultatum, pro pœtentium necessitatibus, prout sibi visum fuerit, dispensabunt, adhibendo semper convenientem distinctionem inter eos, qui solum in Schisma & Hæreses inciderunt, & eos qui eas etiam publicè docuerunt, & alios ad peccandum induxerunt.

Eodem die constituetur dies Festus & solennis, in quo, astante in Ecclesia populi multitudine, Domini Episcopi & omnes Curati in Ecclesiis suis omnia eadem, quæ Clero jam expositæ fuerunt, populo quoque insinuabunt & omnes invitabunt paternè & cum omni affectu ut agnitis erroribus suis ad Ecclesiæ Catholicæ gremium revertantur, promittendo fore, ut omnibus præterita crimina omnia condonentur, & remittantur modo eos ex animo illorum pœniteat & illis renuncient. Præfigatur autem terminus, ut puta tota Paschatis Octava; intra quem terminum omnes Ecclesiæ reconcilientur, alioquin ac lapso contra ipsos & eos etiam qui post reconciliationem ad vomitum reversi fuerint, severissimè procedetur. Dicatur de Facultate concessâ à Reverendissimo Domino Legato Episcopis & aliis, ut absolvere possint omnes, quicunque ad cor reversi fuerint.

Iidem Domini Episcopi & Officiales nominabunt & deputabunt Ecclesiarum Parochialium Rectores, seu alias personas idoneas, quæ Laicos ab Hæresi & Schismate & quibuscunque censuris absolvant, juxta Facultatum formam & tenorem, datâ per

Epis-

Episcopos formulâ, quâ in absolutione & reconciliatione uti debeant.

Eadem poterunt cum Clero totius Diœcesis observari, prout commodius visum fuerit.

Domini Episcopi & Officiales præfati, necnon omnes Curati seu alii ad id deputati habeant librum, in quo nomen & cognomen & parochiam omnium reconciliatorum inscribantur; ut postea sciatur, qui fuerint reconciliati & qui non.

Idem Domini Episcopi & Officiales Octavâ Paschatis elapsâ poterunt facere visitationem, Civitatis primo, deinde Diœcesis, & si qui non fuerint reconciliati, poterunt ad se eos vocare, & cognoscere causas propter quas ab erroribus suis nolunt recedere, & si in eis obstinate perseveraverint, tum contra eos procedant.

In hâc faciendâ visitatione attendant diligenter quæ in hoc Brevi Compendio sunt notata, & maxime faciant, ut omnes Ecclesiastici personæ ostendant titulos suorum Ordinum & Beneficiorum; ut si in eis aliquis alius defectus notetur, illis provideant; & omni studio procurent, ut errores, quibus Diœcesis eorum sunt infecta, extirpentur, & veritas fidei tum in concionibus, tum in Confessionibus doceatur, deputando personas idoneas ad Conciones faciendas & Confessiones audiendas: Id etiam curent, ut sacrorum Canonum instituta in omnibus observentur, & nomen Divi Thomæ Martyris, necnon sanctissimi Domini nostri Papæ, ex libris dispunctum, in illis restituatur, & pro eo secundum morem Ecclesiæ; ut ante Schisma fiebat, oretur.

In publicationibus hujusmodi erit ante omnia faciendæ commemoratio miseriarum & infelicitatis præteritorum temporum, & magnâ gratiâ quam nunc Deus pro suâ misericordiâ populo huic exhibuit,

hortando

hortando omnes ad hæc grato animo cognoscenda, & infinitas gratias divinæ ipsius bonitati assidue agendas.

Hortandi etiam sunt omnes, ut devotè erent Deum pro salute & felici statu horum Serenissimorum, & de hoc Regno optimè meritorum ac merentium, Regum, & specialiter pro felici partu Serenissimæ & piissimæ Reginæ.

Faculteas Curatis & aliis Ecclesiasticis personis per ipsos idoneis cognitis & nominatis per Dominum Legatum concessa est infra Scripta.

UT ipsi omnes & singulæ utriusque sexûs Laicas suæ Parochiæ personas, quarumvis Hæresium, aut novarum Sectarum Professores, aut in eis culpabiles vel suspectas, ac credentes, receptatores & fautores eorum, suos errores agnoscentes, & de illis dolentes, & ad Orthodoxam fidem recipi humiliter postulantes; cognita in eis vera & non ficta aut simulata pœnitentia, ab omnibus & singulis Hæresium, Schismatis & ab Orthodoxa fidæ Apostasiarum & Blasphemiarum, & aliorum quorumcunque errorum, tam sub generali sermone non venientium, peccatis, criminibus, excessibus & delictis, de quibus inquisiti, vel accusati, seu condemnati non fuerint & cum his etiam in foro Conscientiæ tantùm, & quibusvis Excommunicationis Suspensionis, & Interdictorum, & aliis Ecclesiasticis & Temporalibus censuris, sententiis & pœnis, in eos Præmissorum occasione à jure vel ab homine latis vel promulgatis, etiamsi in eis pluribus annis incurrissent, & earum absolutio, Apostolicæ Sedi & in die Cœnæ Domini per literas legi consuetas, reservata existat, injuncta eis pro modo culpæ

pœnitentia

pœnitentia salutari, auctoritate Apostolica in forma Ecclesiæ consueta absolvere, & illos unitati Ecclesiæ Catholicæ restituere; ac omnes Solemnitates, quæ in hujusmodi absolutionibus de jure vel consuetudine solent adhiberi, ratione multitudinis, arbitrio suo in partem vel in totum remittere, secumque super quacunque irregularitate præmissorum occasione contracta dispensare possint & valeant: Præmissis ac Regula de Insordescentibus edita, & quibusvis aliis Constitutionibus & Ordinationibus Apostolicis, etiam in die Cœnæ Domini Legi consuetis, cæterisque contrariis quibuscunque non obstantibus.

Formula Absolutionis.

Dominus noster Jesus Christus, Summus Pontifex, per suam piissimam Misericordiam & Clementiam, vos cruore suo pretiosissimo redemptos, de ineffabili sua pietate, ab omnibus peccatis per vos commissis misericorditer absolvat. Et ego auctoritate Apostolorum Divi Petri & Pauli ac Sedis Apostolicæ mihi Comissa, vos & vestrum quemlibet ab omnibus peccatis, criminibus, excessibus, & delictis; atque ab omni Hæresi, Schismate, Apostasia, irregularitate & quocunque errore vestris, necnon à juramento contra Papatum Romanum per vos præstito, & à quibusvis Excommunicationis, suspensionis, & interdictorum & aliis Sententiis, censuris & pœnis Ecclesiasticis, à jure vel ab homine latis, per vos ratione præmissorum incursis & contractis, absolvo, ac communioni fidelium & Sacrosanctæ Dei Ecclesiæ Sacramentis restituo, reduco, & redintegro; in nomine Patris, & Filii & Spiritus Sancti. Amen.

Addita-

Addiament to Par. I. *to be placed between* Sect. 19. *and* 20.

" *Hiſt. of Reform.* Par. I. pag. 105, 106. " Now the Seſſion of Parliament came on the " 16th. of *January* 1531. and there the King " firſt brought into the Houſe of Lords the " Determination of the Univerſities, &c. (tou- " ching his Marriage with Queen *Catherine.*) " After they were read and conſidered there, " the Lord Chancellor on the 20th. of *March*; " did with other Lords go down to the Houſe " of Commons; and ſhewed the ſame to " them.—— The Matter was alſo brought " before the Convocation, and they having " weighed all that was ſaid on both ſides, " ſeemed ſatisfied, that the Marriage was un- " lawfull, and that the Bull (diſpenſing with " it) was of no force; more not being requi- " red at that time.

The Hiſtorian could not ſafely conclude, that no more was then required, becauſe he could find no more. Much more was then required of, and done by, the Convocation in this affair. I have ſeen an authentick Inſtrument of their whole proceedings herein, drawn up by a Publick Notary at the King's command, and atteſted by the Preſident and other eminent Members of the Convocation, wherein this account is given. Two Queſtions were by the King propounded to the Convocation, to be diſcuſſed and determined by them: The firſt, which was to be conſidered and deter-

mined by the Divines of the Convocation, was conceived in these words: *An ducere Uxorem, cognitam à Fratre, decedente sine prole, sit prohibitio juris divini, indispensabilis à Papâ?* At the discussion and determination of this were present personally in the Convocation Divines 75, by Proxies 197, in all 272. The Names of all are inserted at length with great accuracy in the Instrument before mentioned. Of these 253 determined the Question in the Affirmative; and 19 only held the Negative. The second Question, which was to be considered and determined by the Professors of Law, (Canon, or Civil, or both) Members of the Convocation, was conceived thus: *An carnalis copula inter Illustrissimum Principem Arthurum & Serenissimam Dominam Catherinam Reginam, ex propositis, exhibitis, deductis, & allegatis, sit sufficienter probata?* At the Examination and Decision of this Question were present personally Canonists and Civilians 44, by Proxy 3, in all 47. Of these 41 determined the Question in the Affirmative, and only 6 maintained the Negative. I will subjoyn the Names of those who held the Negative in each Question.

Divines.

Divines. *Perſonaliter præſentes.*

Johannes Epiſcopus Roffen.
Georgius Epiſcopus Landaw.
Ricardus Abbas de Winchelcomb.
Robertus Prior Eccleſiæ Cath. Elienſis.
Ricardus Prior de Walſingham.
Willielmus Prior S. Gregorii Cantuar.
Hugo Abbas de Reading.
Nicolaus Wilſon.
Robertus Shirton.
Ricardus Fetherſtone.
Edwardus Powell.
Nicolaus Metcalfe.
Gilbertus Smith.
Thomas Wadilowe.
Ricardus Ducke.
Thomas Bough.

Per Procuratorem ſuum, Abbatem de *Reading.*

Johannes Abbas de Shirbourne.
Johannes Rector de Edingdon.
Johannes Abbas de Parſhore.

Canoniſts and Civilians. *Perſonaliter præſentes.*

Johannes Epiſcopus Bath & Wells.
Adam Travers.
Petrus Ligham.
Ricardus Harriſon.
Robertus Clyff.
Laurentius Woodcock.

Additament to Par. II. Sect. 76.

I have there ſaid, that beſides the Speeches of *Heath* and *Fecknam*, made in the Houſe of Lords againſt the Alteration of the Liturgy, (mentioned by the Hiſtorian) I had ſeen a Speech of *Scot* Biſhop of *Cheſter*, made at the ſame time in the ſame Cauſe. Since that, I find, that the Hiſtorian hath alſo ſeen it, and giveth an Extract of it with the others: which, being by his Printers fault joyned to the Extract of *Heath's* Speech in the ſame continued Section, and only a few Syllables Intervening, I overlooked. But to make amends for this overſight, I will here correct ſeveral miſtakes committed by the Hiſtorian in relating the Tranſactions of that Seſſions of Parliament: which I am enabled to doe, having carefully peruſed the Journall of the Houſe of Lords in that Seſſion. The Hiſtorian ſaith, That the Bill concerning the New Service, was ſent up by the Commons on the 18th of *April*, and debated in the Houſe of Lords (in which Debate the ſeveral Speeches, before mentioned, were made) and at length paſſed. On the contrary, the Lords Journall teſtifieth, That on *Monday* the 17th. of *April* the Houſe of Lords ſate, and after having read ſeveral Bills, was adjourned by the Lord Keeper to *Wedneſday*, *April* 19th. So that on the 18th. the Houſe ſate not; and even on the 19th. *nil actum*, to uſe the words of the Journall, but was then adjourned to *Saturday* the 22d. Then alſo *nil actum*, but was adjourned to *Tueſday* the 25th.

Par. 2. p. 393.

of

of *April*; on which day (and not before) this Bill was ſent up from the Commons, with 8 other Bills. It was not immediately debated; but was read the firſt time on *Wedneſday* the 26th. the ſecond time on the 27. It was read the laſt time, and concluded, on *Friday* the 28th. It was debated on the two laſt days. *Scot* ſpoke his Speech on the laſt day, and therein undertook to Anſwer the Speech of a *certain Nobleman*, made in the Houſe on the day before in favour of the Bill, wherein that Nobleman had reflected *on the blindneſs of our Forefathers*. From whence it appears to have been debated on the 27th. on which day I ſuppoſe *Fecknam* to have made his Speech. For he was not preſent in the Houſe on the 28th. when the Bill was concluded. For the Hiſtorian miſtaketh when he placeth the Abbot of *Weſtminſter* among the Diſſenters at the concluſion of the Bill; for the Journall hath not his Name. He hath alſo farther miſtaken herein, in leaving out the Biſhops of *Landaff* and *Exeter:* whom the Journall reports to have diſſented with the reſt there named. A like miſtake is committed by him in relating the concluſion of the Act for the Reſtitution of the Firſt-fruits and Tenths to the Crown. He ſaith, It was agreed to by the Lords on the 4th. of *February*, the Archbiſhop of *York*, Biſhops of *London*, *Worceſter*, *Landaff*, *Litchfield*, *Exeter*, *Cheſter*, and *Carliſle*, proteſting againſt it; but that the Biſhops of *Winchester*, *Ely*, &c. were then abſent. Now the Journall of the Lords affirmeth, that the Bill was concluded, *Diſſentientibus Arch. Ebor. Epiſcopis London. Winton.* p. 383.

Winton. Wigorn. Landavan. Coven. & Lich. Ceſtrien. & Carliol. there being that day no more or other Lords Spiritual there preſent. So that indeed *Wincheſter* was there, and *Exeter* was not. But after all, the Bill was not now ultimately concluded; but being ſent back from the Commons with an Amendment, was read and agreed to in the Lords Houſe on the 15th. of *March*; when diſſented from it, beſides the former Prelates, the Biſhop of *Exeter*, and Abbot of *Weſtminſter*: but *London* was not then preſent. In the next place, whereas the Hiſtorian relateth, That upon the ultimate reading and concluſion of the Bill for the Supremacy, after it had been ſent back by the Commons with an Amendment; *it paſſed in the Houſe of Lords with the ſame diſſent*, as before, when it was read on the 18th. of *March*, and ſent down to the Commons, it is a miſtake; for on the 22d of *March*, when it was ultimately read and concluded, the Earl of *Shrewsbury*, the Viſcount *Montacute*, aud the Biſhop of *Worceſter*, are not ſaid in the Journall to have diſſented; all whom the Hiſtorian (therein agreeing with the Journall) maketh to have diſſented on the 18th. Laſtly, when the Hiſtorian, relating that the Biſhop of *Ely* was abſent at the paſſing of this Act: *For though he would not conſent to it, yet having done all that was preſcribed by it ſo often before, he thought it more decent to be abſent, than either to conſent to it or to oppoſe it:* We cannot but except againſt his familiar Method of propoſing ſuch like conjectures as aſſured matters of Hiſtory, and delivering them as peremptorily, as if he had been

p. 386.

p. 387.

been of Councel to the ſeveral Perſons. If for this reaſon the Biſhop of *Ely* had abſented at this time; he ought for the ſame Reaſon to have abſented himſelf on the 26th. of *April*, when was read and concluded in the Lords Houſe *An Act Reſtoring to the Crown the Ancient Juriſdiction over the State Eccleſiaſtical and Spiritual, and aboliſhing all Foreign Power Repugnant to the ſame*, the Biſhop of *Ely* being then preſent, and with other Biſhops, and Viſcount *Montague*, and Abbot *Feckham*, diſſenting from it; as the Journall of the Lords teſtifieth.

FINIS.

The Reader is desired to correct the following

ERRATA *of the Press.*

PArt I. *Page* 1. *Line* 15. ab imo, *for* the *read* that. *P.* 17. *l.* 14. *for* Rober *r.* Robert. In margine, *P.* 18. *l.* 8. ab imo, *for these words*, Apol. adv. Theologos Lovan. cap. 2. In margine, *P.* 19. *l.* 3. ab imo, *for* XIX. *r.* XX. *P.* 24. *l.* 17. & 18. *for* December *r.* Decembris. *P.* 26. *l.* 4. *for* the *r.* these. Ibid. *l.* 30. *dele* a. *P.* 27. *l.* 18. *for* Archbishop *r.* Archbishops. *P.* 32. *l.* 26. *for* Baronies *r.* Barones. *P.* 33. *l.* 3. *aft.* there *add* were. *P.* 34. *l.* 16. *dele* that. *P.* 35. *l.* 24. *for* Arch-Episc. *r.* Archiepiscopal. *P.* 40. *l.* 6. ab imo, *for* times *r.* time. *P.* 44. *l.* 2. ab imo, *for* Norric. *r.* Norwic. *and place it in the margin of p.* 43. *over against l.* 3. *P.* 46. *l.* 5. ab imo, *for* Farnese *r.* Furnese. *P.* 48. *l. penult. for* probably *r.* improbably. *P.* 53. *l.* 10. *for* Baronages *r.* Barthage.

PArt II. *P.* 68. *l.* 18. *after* and *add* by. In marg. *P.* 76. *l.* 5. *set* Pag. 6. 3 *lines lower*. *P.* 90. *l. penult. for* the *r* he. *P.* 93. *l.* 17. *dele* the. *P.* ibid. *l.* 4. ab imo, *for* Affairs *r.* Affair. *P.* 96. *l.* 9. ab imo, *for* of *r.* in. Ibid. *lin. penult. in marg. for* 19. *r.* 15. *P.* 97. *l.* 1. *for* dignetur *r.* dignentur. *P.* 105. *l.* 13. *for* kept *r.* slept. Ibid. *l. penult. for* May 4th *r.* May 4th. *P.* 106. *l.* 17. *for* Malgrave *r.* Walgrave. *P.* 107. *l.* 12. *for* 14th. Aug. *r.* 14th. of August. *P.* 110. *l.* 14. *aft.* him *add* and..... Ibid. *l.* 17. *aft.* unto *add* such. *P.* 112. *l.* 1. *for* Masco *r.* Alasco. *P.* 114. *l.* 15. *for* London and the *r.* London and other. *P.* 117. *l.* 25. *for* before *r.* being. *P.* 121. *l.* 2. *for* June *r.* Anno. In marg. *l.* 12. *for* Chron. *r.* Chron. Ser. *P.* 123. *l.* 16. *for* Delgarum *r.* Belgarum. *P.* 124. *l.* 4. *aft.* Transcript *add* of the Historian. Ibid. *l.* 20. *for* was *r.* may. *P.* 126. *l.* 6. *for* I know *r.* I know not. *P.* 128. *l.* 18. *for* anni *r.* annis. Ibid. *l.* 22. *for* Nocholaus *r.* Nicholaus. Ibid. *l.* 30. *for* notorius *r.* notorie. *P.* 129. *l.* 7. *for* iniquitates *r.* iniquitatis. *P.* 130. *l. ult. for* Cester. *r.* Cestr. *P.* 131. *l.* 1. *for* professione in *r.* professionem. *P.* 135. *l.* 13. *aft.* incline *add* to believe. Ibid. 23. *for* giving *r.* given. *P.* 136. *l.* 16. in marg. *for* Fasd. *r.* Faculz. *P.* 139. *l.* 2. *aft.* Brother *add* and. *P.* 140. *l.* 24. *for* fallly *r.* fully. Ibid. *l.* 27. *for* Beacon *r.* Beaton. *P.* 141. *l.* 8. *for* Beacon *r.* Beaton. *P.* 143. *l.* 23. *for* Dentham *r.* Bentham. *P.* 144. *l.* 13. *for* which the *r.* which is the. *P.* 148. *l.* 21. *for* Herbert *r.* Hubert. Ibid. *l. ult. for* nata *r.* Name. *P.* 149. *l.* 4. ab imo, *for* the *r.* that. *P.* 150. *l.* 15. *for* Holman *r.* Holiman. *P.* 152. *l.* 5. *aft.* sincere *add* and. Ibid. *l.* 13. *for* Proctours *r.* Doctors. Ibid. *l.* 25. *for* Salkel *r.* Salkeld. *P.* 154. *l.* 18. *for* believed *r.* delivered. *P.* 155 *l.* 18. *for* was done *r.* was not done. *P.* 158. *l.* 8. *aft.* had *add* been. *P.* 159. *l.* 22. *for* Candeury *r.* Candeuri. *P.* 162 *l.* 4. ab imo, *for* anxius *r.* anxias. *P.* 164 *l.* 4. *for* debimus *r.* debemus. Ibid. *l.* 6. *for* discere *r.* dicere. Ibid. *l. penult. for* qua *r.* quam. *P.* 165 *l.* 14. *for* Doctissimus *r.* doctissimis. Ibid. *l.* 18. *for* naturâ deliberationem *r.* maturâ deliberatione. *P.* 166. *l.* 10. ab imo, *for* hee rinne serit *r.* heer inne servit. Ibid. *l.* 5. ab imo, *aft.* alle *add* her. Ibid. *before* Prince *add* the. *P.* 167 *l.* 4. *for* enthe *r.* erthe. Ibid *l.* 4. ab imo, *for* the reinne *r.* thereinne. *P.* 168. *l.* 3. *for* tethegeren *r.* tethegeven. *P.* 173. *l.* 18. *for* with *r.* with. Ibid *l.* 28. *for* to time *r.* in time. *P.* 175. *l.* 3. *for* conteation *r.* contentation. *P.* 176. *l.* 15. *for* There *r.* These.

The Author hath not been able to correct the mistakes of the Press commined in the Sheets N. and O. having not yet seen them since they were wrought off.